

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 9922. A bill to authorize a 5-year hydrologic study and investigation of the Delmarva Peninsula; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 9923. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 9924. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 9925. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 9926. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 9927. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 9928. A bill to provide fellowships for elementary and secondary school personnel, to improve the quality of teacher training programs and to establish a National Teacher Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 9929. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.J. Res. 581. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to extend through 1966 his proclamation of a period to "See the United States", and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 582. Joint resolution providing for the erection of a memorial statue to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of American rocketry; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.J. Res. 583. Joint resolution to establish the fourth Friday in September of every year as American Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. Res. 481. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H. Res. 484. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. Res. 485. Resolution that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that oppression of minorities in Rumania through a systematic plan launched by the Communist regime in control of Rumania be condemned and the President of the United States is requested to take appropriate steps in our

relations with the Rumanian Government as are likely to bring relief to the persecuted minorities in the controversial Transylvania region of that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

341. By Mr. PEPPER: Senate Memorial No. 917 of the Florida State Legislature, a memorial to the Congress of the United States urging the preservation of the dual banking system and defeat of any measure requiring a State bank to become a member of the Federal Reserve System; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

342. Also, Senate Memorial No. 1182 of the Florida State Legislature, a memorial to the President of the United States of America, urging construction of an urban male Job Corps Training Center at Camp Blanding, Fla.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

343. Also, Senate Memorial No. 1188 of the Florida State Legislature, a memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting a continuation of national policy employing private enterprise to provide goods and services for the space and defense programs which was promulgated by the administration of President Dwight David Eisenhower and continued under the administration of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

344. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to preserving the dual banking system of States and Federal banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

345. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to fulfilling the objectives of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

346. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, requesting the Congress to conduct an investigation of the leadership and the activities of certain civil rights groups; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO (by request):

H.R. 9930. A bill for the relief of Irwin Hensler, Danuta and Edward Hensler and their minor children Olgiard, and Beata Hensler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 9931. A bill for the relief of Jose Cruz Orozoco-Arana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9932. A bill for the relief of Joseph H. Bonduki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9933. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fabiana Hodullich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9934. A bill for the relief of Caterina Iovino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 9935. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Fasulo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 9936. A bill for the relief of Luis Palomares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 9937. A bill for the relief of Nuno Medeiros Franco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9938. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bozenna Czarnecka and her minor daughter, Eva Czarnecka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9939. A bill for the relief of Sebastiano Livotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9940. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marisa Sordelli LoMugno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 9941. A bill for the relief of Vilma Henson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9942. A bill for the relief of Peter Paul Vella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 9943. A bill for the relief of Elisa Fat-torusso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DERLIN:

H.R. 9944. A bill for the relief of Erman Donald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

246. By the SPEAKER: Petition of St. Landry Parish Police Jury, Opelousas, La., conveying deep sympathy in the loss of Representative T. ASHTON THOMPSON and requesting that the records show that a resolution was adopted as an expression of respect to his memory; to the Committee on House Administration.

247. Also, petition of Washington State Grange, Seattle, Wash., to enact legislation relative to a vacancy in the office of the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

248. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Fishing Bridge Station, Wyo., relative to oil depletion allowances for Federal income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 19, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou before whom the prayers of Thy children go up as incense from contrite souls, speak to our burdened and longing hearts as we lift our lives to Thy searching gaze.

We would test our thoughts, and deeds, and words, not against the faulty background of our fellows but with our eyes upon the transparent glory of the crystal Christ.

In these hard bested and dangerous days we would find peace in the midst of the storm, and above all cleansing for the baseness of our own hearts. Sober us with a sense of personal responsibility as to what we contribute to our own age and with the realization that Thy call to every one of us is to make available for the world's good his own life, clean, strong, honest, trustworthy, and serviceable.

In the light of this challenge we pray for ourselves that we may not fail our own generation and Thee, that the paganism that afflicts the world may be redeemed into decency, justice, and

mercy and into the uniting brotherhood of that One who taught us to pray that His radiant kingdom may come.

We ask it in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 16, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, transmitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2080. An act to provide for the coinage of the United States;

H.R. 225. An act to amend chapter 1 of title 38, United States Code, and incorporate therein specific statutory authority for the Presidential memorial certificate program; and

H.R. 5242. An act to amend paragraph (10) of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to change the basis for determining whether a proposed unification or acquisition of control comes within the exemption provided for by such paragraph.

THE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. INOUE, and by unanimous consent, the following calendar measures were considered and acted upon as indicated:

ELIZABETH KAM OI HU

The bill (S. 135) for the relief of Elizabeth Kam Oi Hu was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Elizabeth Kam Oi Hu, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of paragraph (5), subsection (a) of section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, may be naturalized by taking, prior to one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, an oath as prescribed by section 337 of such Act. From and after naturalization under

this Act, the said Elizabeth Kam Oi Hu shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 434), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to provide for the restoration of U.S. citizenship to Elizabeth Kam Oi Hu which was lost by voting in a foreign election.

ANGEL LAGMAY

The bill (S. 136) for the relief of Angel Lagmay was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Angel Lagmay may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act, and a petition may be filed by Cornelio Lagmay, a citizen of the United States, in behalf of the said Angel Lagmay, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 435), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the entry into the United States in a nonquota status of an alien son adopted by a citizen of the United States.

ROSAURO L. LINDOGAN

The bill (S. 137) for the relief of Rosaura L. Lindogan was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rosaura L. Lindogan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence of such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 436), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United

States to Rosaura L. Lindogan. The bill provides for an appropriate quota deduction and for the payment of the required visa fee.

KEVIN DILLON SCHOFIELD

The bill (S. 612) for the relief of Kevin Dillon Schofield was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kevin Dillon Schofield shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence of such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 437), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Kevin Dillon Schofield. The bill provides for an appropriate quota deduction and for the payment of the required visa fee.

KALOYAN D. KALOYANOFF

The bill (S. 870) for the relief of Kaloyan D. Kaloyanoff was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the periods of time Kaloyan D. Kaloyanoff has resided in the United States since his lawful admission for permanent residence on November 10, 1958, shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 438), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary, who was lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on November 10, 1958, to file a petition for naturalization.

FOSTER MASAHIKO GUSHARD

The bill (H.R. 1314) for the relief of Foster Masahiko Gushard was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 439), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the entry into the United States in a non-quota status of an alien child adopted by citizens of the United States.

MRS. ANA CRISTINA RAINFORTH

The bill (H.R. 1322) for the relief of Mrs. Ana Cristina Rainforth was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 440), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to preserve non-quota immigrant status in behalf of the widow of a U.S. citizen.

MAJ. KENNETH F. COYKENDALL

The bill (H.R. 1487) for the relief of Maj. Kenneth F. Coykendall, U.S. Army, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 441), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation, is to relieve Maj. Kenneth F. Coykendall, U.S. Army, of all liability to repay \$752.38 representing overpayments of active duty pay as a member of the U.S. Army in the period from July 1, 1949, through February 18, 1962, inclusive, which he received as a result of erroneous credit of U.S. merchant marine midshipman service for longevity pay purposes. The bill provides for a refund of amounts repaid or withheld because of the liability.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 1853) for the relief of Giuseppe Delina was announced as next in order.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, over.
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ALBERT MARKS

The bill (H.R. 1889) for the relief of Albert Marks was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 443), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to waive the excluding provision of existing law relating

to one who has suffered prior attacks of insanity in behalf of the husband of a lawful permanent resident of the United States. The bill provides for the posting of a bond as a guaranty that the beneficiary will not become a public charge.

ALFRED ESTRADA

The bill (H.R. 3625) for the relief of Alfred Estrada was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 444), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable Alfred Estrada to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act, notwithstanding the fact that the continuity of his residence has been broken through employment abroad with an American firm.

ANNA MARIA HEILAND

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 76) for the relief of Anna Maria Heiland which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 8, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and "Provided, That if the said Anna Maria Heiland is not entitled to medical care under the Dependent's Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (3) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anna Maria Heiland may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provision of such Act: Provided, That if the said Anna Maria Heiland is not entitled to medical care under the Dependent's Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. This section shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 445), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to waive the excluding provision of existing law relating to one who has suffered previous at-

tacks of insanity in behalf of the wife of a U.S. citizen member of our Armed Forces. The bill has been amended to provide for the posting of a bond as a guaranty that the beneficiary will not become a public charge in the event she is not eligible for medical care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act.

PEDRO ANTONIO JULIO SANCHEZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 375) for the relief of Pedro Antonio Julio Sanchez which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 8, after the word "since", to strike out "September 1, 1958" and insert "September 14, 1958", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Pedro Antonio Julio Sanchez may be naturalized upon compliance with all of the requirements of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that no period of residence or physical presence within the United States or any State shall be required, in addition to his residence and physical presence within the United States since September 14, 1958.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 446), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization. The amendment is technical in nature to reflect the precise date of his first entry into the United States.

VASIL LACI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 872) for the relief of Vasil Laci which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504), Vasil Laci shall be held and considered to have been paroled into the United States on the date of the enactment of this Act, as provided for in the said Act of July 14, 1960.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 447), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to provide that Vasil Laci shall be considered to have been paroled into the United States as a refugee on the date of the enactment of this act under the provisions of Public Law 86-648. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents.

KIM SA SUK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 879) for the relief of Kim Sa Suk which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 205(c), relating to the number of petitions which may be approved in behalf of eligible orphans, shall be inapplicable in the case of a petition filed in behalf of Kim Sa Suk by Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Caperna, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 448), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to facilitate the entry into the United States in a nonquota status of an eligible orphan adopted by citizens of the United States, notwithstanding the fact that the prospective adoptive parents have previously had two petitions approved in behalf of eligible orphans. As introduced, the bill would have waived the provision of existing law relating to one who is afflicted with tuberculosis. However, the beneficiary will be eligible for an administrative waiver of the excludable ground upon enactment of the bill.

MRS. HARLEY BREWER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1198) for the relief of Mrs. Harley Brewer which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 3, after the word "Act", to strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Harley Brewer (or, in the event of her death, to her estate) of San Ildefonso Pueblo, New Mexico, the widow of Harley Brewer, the sum of \$4,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all the claims of the said Harley Brewer against the United States for compensation authorized to be paid to him by Private Law 88-360, approved October 14, 1964, but which was not so paid to the said Harley Brewer by reason of his death prior to enactment of the said private law: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 449), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill, as amended is to pay to Mrs. Harley Brewer (or, in the event of her death, to her estate) of San Ildefonso Pueblo, N. Mex., the widow of Harley Brewer, the sum of \$4,500, in full satisfaction of all the claims of the said Harley Brewer against the United States for compensation authorized to be paid to him by Private Law 88-360, approved October 14, 1964, but which was not so paid by reason of his death prior to the enactment of the private law.

JULIO DUMAS AND HIS WIFE,
JOSEPHINE DUMAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1119) for the relief of Julio Dumas and his wife, Josephine Dumas which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "Julio Dumas and Josephine Dumas" and insert "Julio Francisco Dumas y Alcocer and Maria Josefa Dumas"; in line 9, after the word "said", to strike out "Julio Dumas and Josephine Dumas" and insert "Julio Francisco Dumas y Alcocer"; and on page 2, line 3, after the word "to", to strike out "their" and insert "his"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, (a) for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Julio Francisco Dumas y Alcocer and Maria Josefa Dumas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on June 12, 1961, upon payment of the required visa fees.

(b) The said Julio Francisco Dumas y Alcocer may be naturalized upon compliance with all of the requirements of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that no period of residence or physical presence within the United States or any State shall be required, in addition to his residence and physical presence within the United States since June 12, 1961.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Julio Francisco Dumas y Alcocer and Maria Josefa Dumas."

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 450), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Julio Francisco Dumas y Alcocer and Maria Josefa Dumas as of June 12, 1961, the date on which they were lawfully admitted as nonimmigrants. The bill also provides that the residence and

physical presence in the United States of Julio Francisco Dumas y Alcocer since that date shall be compliance with section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The bill has been amended to delete the name of Maria Josefa Dumas from section (b) of the bill, as it relates to naturalization. The bill has also been amended to correct the spelling of the beneficiaries' names.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of the period from August 31 through September 6 in 1965, as "National American Legion Baseball Week," was announced as next in order.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CAPT. PAUL W. OBERDORFER

The bill (H.R. 1217) for the relief of Capt. Paul W. Oberdorfer was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 452), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay Capt. Paul W. Oberdorfer the sum of \$130.63 in full settlement of his claim for the cost of transporting his wife from New Orleans, La., to San Francisco, Calif.

STATEMENT

The facts in the case are found in House Report No. 74, 89th Congress, 1st session, as follows:

"The Department of the Air Force, in its report indicating that it favors enactment of H.R. 5743, admits that special orders authorizing transportation for the wife of Captain Oberdorfer were issued in error through the fault of U.S. Air Force personnel alone without any fault or responsibility on the part of Captain and Mrs. Oberdorfer. The erroneous orders upon which Mrs. Oberdorfer traveled were in violation of regulations which prohibit the furnishing of transportation at Government expense to a dependent who is serving in Federal military duty on the effective date of the military sponsor's permanent change of station order.

"The facts giving rise to the erroneous transportation orders are that Captain Oberdorfer was issued permanent change of station orders to California, effective February 10, 1962. At that date his wife was on duty as a nurse with the 159th Evacuation Hospital, Louisiana National Guard Unit, at Fort Sill, Okla. As soon as Mrs. Oberdorfer was relieved from her active duty tour, which had extended from January 3, 1962, until August 6, 1962, she proceeded to California in accordance with travel orders issued by the Air Force. The Air Force concedes that Captain Oberdorfer's orders were prepared in such a way that he could easily assume that Mrs. Oberdorfer was authorized transportation to California at Government expense at a later date. While Air Force personnel should have questioned the travel orders for Mrs. Oberdorfer as authorizing movement of a dependent who was herself on active duty at the effective date of the captain's permanent change of station, they failed to do so. Affidavits from the Air Force administrative personnel involved state that

they were aware that Mrs. Oberdorfer had been on duty as a nurse, but were under the impression that travel undertaken after her discharge from active duty was proper at Government expense.

"In the light of the admissions of error by the Air Force with no fault on the part of Captain and Mrs. Oberdorfer who relied on assurances that the cost of her transportation was reimbursable, it does not seem fair and equitable that the cost of transportation should be borne by Captain Oberdorfer. Accordingly the committee reports favorably on H.R. 5743 and recommends that the bill do pass."

In agreement with the House the committee recommends favorable enactment.

CWO ELDEN R. COMER

The bill (H.R. 1374) for the relief of CWO Elden R. Comer was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 453), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay to CWO Elden R. Comer, U.S. Navy, retired, the sum of \$1,680.62 in full settlement of his claim against the United States for additional retired pay which accrued during the period August 30, 1946, to October 17, 1952, inclusive.

GEORGE A. GRABERT

The bill (H.R. 2881) for the relief of George A. Grabert was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 454), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay George A. Grabert, of Mount Vernon, Ind., \$277.26 in full settlement of his claims against the United States for refund of amounts required to be paid by him to the United States on account of salary overpayments resulting from longevity promotions being granted on incorrect dates in connection with his employment with the U.S. Post Office Department during the period beginning July 1, 1950, and ending November 16, 1956.

ADDITIONAL PLACE FOR HOLDING COURT IN THE DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA

The bill (S. 102) to provide an additional place for holding court in the district of North Dakota was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 114 of title 28, United States Code, is amended as follows:

In the second sentence of paragraph (4) after "Minot" insert "and Williston".

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 455), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide that the city of Williston be an additional place for holding court in the district of North Dakota.

STATEMENT

An identical bill, S. 2392, of the 88th Congress, was reported favorably by the committee. All of the facts and justification for this legislation are contained in Senate Report 1391 of the 88th Congress and are as follows:

"The Judicial Conference of the United States, at its meeting on March 16 and 17, 1964, voted to disapprove the legislation due to the fact that it did not have sufficient cases to justify the holding of terms of court at Williston, N. Dak.

"Since that time the committee has received information from the Honorable George S. Register, the chief judge of the district of North Dakota with reference to the legislation. The chief judge supports the legislation as do the commissioners of the city of Williston and the Williston Chamber of Commerce. The chief judge in his comment states that Williston occupies a rather unique position among the cities of the State. He points out that the Garrison Dam project will result in substantial industrialization, great economic growth, and development in that area. Oil has been discovered in the immediate vicinity of Williston and he anticipates that there will also be a substantial oil and mineral development. He further contended that the Williston area of this State has a very promising future and that the developments referred to are in the not distant future. It will mean a substantial and rapid increase in population as well as business. Representatives of the bar association called upon the chief judge urging the legislation and it is understood that a new Federal building is to be built at the site of Williston. If Williston is designated as a place for holding court in the district of North Dakota quarters for court may be provided for in the new Federal building.

"The committee, after a review of the facts surrounding this legislation, takes the view that there are adequately sufficient indications to believe that the city of Williston will be, in the very near future, such a community as would require the sitting of the U.S. district court for that district. In view of these facts the committee recommends that the bill, S. 2392, be considered favorably."

After consideration, the committee adheres to its former recommendation and again recommends that the bill, S. 102, be considered favorably.

SAMUEL L. MCCOY

The bill (S. 850) for the relief of Samuel L. McCoy was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Samuel L. McCoy, of Roxbury, Massachusetts, the sum of \$760, in full satisfaction of all his claims against the United States for reimbursement of payments made by him in connection with an accident involving personal

injuries to the occupant of a house owned by the Veterans' Administration and managed by the said Samuel L. McCoy as management broker for the regional office of the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 456), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide for the payment of \$760 to Samuel L. McCoy, Roxbury, Mass., in full satisfaction of all his claims against the United States for reimbursement of payments made by him in connection with an accident involving personal injuries to an occupant of a house owned by the Veterans' Administration and managed by Samuel L. McCoy as management broker.

STATEMENT

The facts of the case are found in the report of the Veterans' Administration addressed to the chairman of the committee, dated June 11, 1965, and are as follows:

"The property involved was located at 93 Devon Street, Dorchester, Mass. It had been acquired by the Veterans' Administration under the veterans' loan guarantee program established by title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (now 38 U.S.C. ch. 37). This property was sold to a Mr. Pinnick in 1957, who, in turn, defaulted. Following the foreclosure of his defaulted mortgage the property was reacquired by the Veterans' Administration on June 29, 1959.

"When a property is acquired by the Veterans' Administration, the services of a management broker are secured to supervise the property and endeavor to accomplish its resale. The duties of such a management broker include the safeguarding and preservation of the property. He is required to inspect the property at least once monthly, for which service he receives a fee of \$7.50 per month, and may obligate the Veterans' Administration for the cost of emergency repairs, not to exceed \$50 for any one item.

"Mr. Samuel L. McCoy was engaged as a management broker to handle the property for resale. During the period of offering the property for sale, Mr. McCoy rented the house to Mrs. Evelyn Pinnick who had continued in possession after the foreclosure. She failed to make rental payments and Mr. McCoy took eviction action by giving her the 14 days notice to quit the premises as required by the law of Massachusetts. This 14-day period expired on September 1, 1959. Mrs. Pinnick failed to surrender possession of the house to Mr. McCoy and on September 3, 1959, she was injured in a fall on the front steps.

"Mrs. Pinnick filed suit against Mr. McCoy in the superior court, Suffolk County, Mass., alleging that Mr. McCoy controlled and managed the property and that her injury resulted from his negligence in not maintaining the premises in as good condition as existed on the date when she became a tenant. The suit proceeded to trial and during the course of the trial the matter was settled, Mr. McCoy paying Mrs. Pinnick \$210 damages. In addition to paying the \$210 dam-

ages, Mr. McCoy paid attorney fees amounting to \$550 to the attorney whom he had selected to represent him. Under S. 850 the Government would pay this sum of \$760 to Mrs. McCoy."

Mrs. Pinnick elected to exercise her right to sue Mr. McCoy instead of the Federal Government. It is the feeling of the committee that this tort action was one properly lying against the Government rather than against the claimant, who was an innocent victim of Mrs. Pinnick's election. Accordingly, the committee recommends favorable enactment.

MRS. HERTHA L. WOHLMUTH

The bill (S. 711) for the relief of Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 32(a) (2) (D) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth of Munich, Bavaria, United States Zone, shall be held and considered to have been a United States citizen at all times since December 7, 1941, and any notice of claim filed under such Act by the said Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth within six months after the enactment of this Act shall be deemed to be timely filed.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 457), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is that, for the purposes of section 32(a) (2) (D) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth, of Munich, Bavaria, U.S. Zone, shall be held and considered to have been a U.S. citizen at all times since December 7, 1941, and any notice of claim filed under such act by the said Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth within 6 months after the enactment of this act shall be deemed to be timely filed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1861) to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster was announced as next in order.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

H.R. 8484

The bill (H.R. 8484) to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of members of the Armed Forces in a change of permanent station was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 460), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The basic objective of this bill is to broaden the authority for the sea transportation at

Government expense of automobiles owned by military personnel.

The principal reason for such broadening is to provide relief to members of the Armed Forces ordered to Vietnam from permanent duty stations outside the United States.

EXPLANATION

Under current law a member of the Armed Forces ordered to make a permanent change of station is entitled to have one automobile owned by him and for his personal use shipped to his new station at the expense of the United States. This authority is limited to transportation from the port serving his old station to the port serving his new duty station. In contrast, a member of the Armed Forces is authorized to move his household goods to places other than his new duty station when he is ordered to a permanent change of station.

The restriction in current law on the transportation of automobiles has created hardships for members of the Armed Forces serving in overseas areas such as Hawaii, Okinawa, and the Philippines when they are ordered to an area such as Vietnam where they cannot take their dependents or automobiles. In these cases the dependents and household goods are returned to a location in the United States, but the member now must either sell the automobile or pay the cost of overseas transportation and port handling charges for shipment to a port in the United States. Members of the 1st Marine Brigade who were ordered from Hawaii to Vietnam in May of this year have experienced the problem this bill is intended to relieve.

The bill would amend existing law to provide that the Secretary of the service concerned may authorize the transportation of an automobile owned by the member for his personal use or the use of his dependents to the member's new station or to such other place as the Secretary may authorize. The bill would be retroactive in effect to May 1, 1965, to cover the shipment from Hawaii of motor vehicles owned by members of the 1st Marine Brigade who were transferred to Vietnam.

Use of foreign-flag shipping service

The existing authority for the sea shipment of automobiles owned by members of the Armed Forces is limited to vessels owned, leased, or chartered by the United States, or to privately owned American shipping services. This bill would permit the use of foreign-flag shipping services if shipping services on vessels owned, leased, or chartered by the United States or privately owned American shipping services are not reasonably available. In a few instances members of the Armed Forces are transferred between overseas duty stations not served by U.S. vessels or privately owned American shipping services. Consequently, the shipment of privately owned vehicles is either disapproved or the automobile must be transshipped through an American port to the final destination. If the shipment is denied the member is disadvantaged for reasons beyond his control. If the automobile is first shipped to the United States the costs are greater than if foreign shipping services could be used.

Shipment of a replacement vehicle

Under the law now in effect a member of the Armed Forces whose automobile is lost or destroyed for reasons beyond his control after it has been shipped at Government expense to his permanent duty station is not entitled to have a replacement automobile shipped at Government expense. This law is different from the one applicable to civilian employees, who may have a replacement automobile shipped at Government expense when the head of the department concerned determines that such replacement is necessary for reasons beyond the control of the employee and is in the interest of the Government. This bill would equalize the en-

titlement of members of the Armed Forces with that of civilian employees in this respect.

The committee expects this authority to be carefully administered. The term "replacement" should be strictly construed so that the transportation of a second automobile at Government expense is authorized only in good-faith cases of hardship.

Definition of the term "change of permanent station"

For the purpose of shipment of automobiles of members of the Armed Forces at Government expense, the bill would define the term "change of permanent station" to include changes from home to first station when called to active duty and from last station to home upon separation or retirement and an authorized change in home yard or home port of a vessel, in addition to transfers or assignments between permanent posts of duty or official stations. The committee was informed that this definition is consistent with the definition applied under the Joint Travel Regulations for the purpose of entitlement to shipment of household effects and that this definition conforms to the practice now being followed with respect to the shipment of automobiles. Hence this definition ratifies the current construction of the phrase "to his new station" in section 2634 of title 10, United States Code.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. YARBOROUGH, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 114

"Concurrent resolution calling on the U.S. Congress to investigate the possibilities of Communist activities and infiltration of the so-called civil rights groups now active in street demonstrations throughout the United States

"Whereas for the past several years certain so-called civil rights organizations have demonstrated and picketed throughout the United States; and

"Whereas said organizations have heretofore exerted extreme influence on certain communities and extreme influence on domestic policies of the U.S. Government; and

"Whereas the said civil rights organizations have used the said demonstrations to raise money from certain members of the general public throughout the United States; and

"Whereas said civil rights organizations have injected themselves into the foreign policy of the United States; and

"Whereas certain civil rights organizations have insisted on the withdrawal of the United States from Vietnam; and

"Whereas it has become known that members of the said groups and leaders of the organizations have Communist affiliations and Communist backgrounds: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Mississippi (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the U.S. Congress, through proper committee either in the U.S. Senate or in the U.S. House of Representatives, is hereby requested to conduct an investigation of the leadership and the activities of the so-called civil rights groups; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to furnish copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, and the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate July 8, 1965.

"CLARENCE GASTIN,

"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives July 8, 1965.

"JAMES A. MORROW, JR.,

"Acting Speaker of the House of Representatives."

AMENDMENT OF LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF OKLAHOMA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, together with 17 other Senators, I am the sponsor of S. 1648, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act allows Federal agencies to establish new or increased fees for entrance to or use of Federal lakes, parks, and other facilities.

Already, the Department of Agriculture has announced new fees for their facilities in Oklahoma. Fee schedules are expected to be announced soon by the Department of the Interior and by the Corps of Engineers.

The bill I have introduced would prohibit fees being charged for use of or access to Federal lakes and give either House of Congress a veto over any fees established on other Federal installations.

As more and more people throughout the country learn of the establishment of these new fees, I believe they will join the increasing number of citizens who are up in arms about this new practice.

I have contacted the distinguished chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee [Mr. JACKSON], and have urged him to hold immediate public hearings on our bill. I hope this can be done expeditiously, and we can very soon have favorable action on the bill by the committee and by the Senate.

I highly commend the Oklahoma Legislature for its informed recognition of this problem by the passage of a resolution in opposition to the Land and Water Conservation Act, as it is now written. Mr. President, for myself and my senior colleague [Mr. MONRONEY], I ask unani-

mous consent that a copy of that resolution, authored by State Representatives Connor, Blankenship, G. T., Skeith, Hopkins, Raibourn, Willis, Odum, V. H., Mountford, and Peterson of the house, and State Senators Bartlett, Garrison, Stansberry, Bradley, Gee, Graves, Ham, Hamilton, Horn, Luton, Muldrow, Murphy, Payne, Rhoades, Selman, Smith, Stipe, and Young of the senate, be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, and be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 68

Concurrent resolution expressing opposition to the imposition of user fees for the use of public land and water areas and urging repeal of such legislation; and directing distribution

Whereas the amount of leisure time available to the average citizen has increased greatly in recent years; and

Whereas the constructive and intelligent use of this increased leisure is one of the great challenges of our time; and

Whereas with the growing amount of leisure, our citizens must have proper outlets and opportunities to make wise use of this time; and

Whereas the State parks and recreation areas are provided for the leisure-hour needs of all Oklahoma citizens to enjoy; and

Whereas it has long been the policy of the State of Oklahoma to make available to the people of Oklahoma these parks and recreation areas without charging a fee for their use; and

Whereas the U.S. Congress passed the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 which provides for user fees to be paid by those desiring to use certain land and water areas; and

Whereas these parks and recreation areas should be as accessible to the low income groups as to higher income groups; and

Whereas licenses to fish and to use a boat on these waters are already required of those who would use these areas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 30th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

SECTION 1. That we oppose any measure which tends to discourage or restrict the free use of public land or water recreation areas.

SEC. 2. That we oppose the imposition of user fees for the use of public land or water areas in the State of Oklahoma, provided in the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, and urge that such provision be stricken from the law.

SEC. 3. That duly authenticated copies of this resolution be prepared and forwarded to Senators MIKE MONRONEY and FRED R. HARRIS; Representatives CARL ALBERT, PAGE BELCHER, ED EDMONDSON, JOHN JARMAN, JED JOHNSON, and TOM STEED; the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States; the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; the majority and minority floor leaders of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States; the Secretary of the Department of the Interior; and the Corps of Engineers.

Adopted by the Senate the 25th day of May 1965.

DEWEY F. BARTLETT,
Acting President of the Senate.

Adopted by the House of Representatives the 31st day of May 1965.

J. D. MCCARTY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 1735. A bill relating to the use by the Secretary of the Interior of land at La Jolla, Calif., donated by the University of California for a marine biological research laboratory, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 463).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 8720. An act to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of Guam (Rept. No. 466); and

H.R. 8721. An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of the Virgin Islands (Rept. No. 465).

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS FOR NAVIGATION AND FLOOD CONTROL—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 464)

Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, reported an original bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 2297. A bill to amend the act of September 2, 1964; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CURTIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 2298. A bill for the relief of Iris Marjorie Wareing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 2299. A bill to provide for the mandatory retirement of district judges of the United States for permanent physical or mental disability; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LAUSCHE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 2300. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to the above bill when reported by Mr. McNAMARA, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. FONG:

S. 2301. A bill for the relief of Christine Fung Kee Lee Verhoeff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S.J. Res. 99. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning October 25 in each year as National Parkinson Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF SEPTEMBER 2, 1964, RELATING TO COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN LANDS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in the 88th Congress there was passed Public Law 561. The purpose of the law was to permit the payment of compensation for lands taken for canal purposes in irrigation districts in those instances where compensation was not paid.

Proceeding under that act, in a case in the U.S. district court in Nebraska, a technical problem arose. It seems prudent that there be a clarifying and technical amendment to Public Law 561 of the 88th Congress. Today I am introducing in behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. HRUSKA] such an amendment. I hope that it can be acted upon early. It would not add to the liability or expenditures on the part of the Government with respect to what was the original intent of the Congress in enacting Public Law 561 in the 88th Congress. It is in the nature of a technical and clarifying amendment; in the opinion of the attorneys it is wise that the proposed action be taken. I therefore send the bill to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2297) to amend the act of September 2, 1964, introduced by Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MANDATORY RETIREMENT OF DISTRICT JUDGES FOR CERTAIN REASONS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill and ask that it be printed and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2299) to provide for the mandatory retirement of district judges of the United States for permanent physical or mental disability, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, this bill deals with the judiciary and contemplates compelling the involuntary retirement of a judge who, by a judicial council, has been declared incapable of filling the duties of his office caused either by mental or physical disability.

Under existing constitutional and statutory provisions, if a judge is incompetent because of physical or mental incapacity, a judicial council can make such certification to the President of the United States. When such certification is made, the President can appoint another judge for the district where the in-

capacitated judge presides. When this procedure is followed, there will be two judges in the district, one newly appointed and the other the incapacitated judge will be allowed to continue to perform his duties.

The bill which I have sent to the desk contemplates making it possible for the President to appoint a new judge, and compels the involuntary retirement with full pay of the judge who is incapacitated.

Mr. President, I yield the floor

COLD WAR VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. COTTON) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, Senate bill 2282, introduced by me on July 13, is being held at the desk for additional cosponsors. I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk through Friday of this week to provide an opportunity for Senators to cosponsor it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 23, 1965, the names of Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CLARK, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. INOUE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. TALMADGE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2180) to improve the safety of railroad transportation under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, introduced by Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. MOSS) on June 23, 1965.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF A. ROSS ECKLER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, July 22, 1965, at 10 a.m., in room 6202 of the New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of A. Ross Eckler, of New York, to be Director of the Census.

Persons interested in testifying on the nomination may arrange to do so by calling the committee staff, 225-5451.

The hearing will be before the full committee.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 19, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2080) to provide for the coinage of the United States.

DR. ELSIE WIECZOROWSKI, A PEDIATRICIAN FROM ILLINOIS, PART OF THE PROJECT HOPE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is always gratifying to hear that a citizen of the great State of Illinois has rendered great service. Dr. Elsie Wieczorowski, a pediatrician from Illinois, has been part of that magnificent medical-education program, Project HOPE.

Dr. Wieczorowski, as a recent story in the Chicago Tribune explains, was in the new Republic of Guinea for 2 months as a volunteer aboard the *SS Hope*. She is among many from Illinois who have served HOPE during the project's 5 years of operation.

Her dedicated service to humanity in the wards of the great white hospital ship as well as in the clinics throughout the country is depicted in this excellent article by Margaret Mohan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chicago Tribune article of May 23, 1965, be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"HOPE" TRIP FASCINATING, DOCTOR SAYS—
LEARNED ABOUT TROPICAL ILLS

(By Margaret Mohan)

The word "HOPE" stands for Health Opportunity for People Everywhere, and "everywhere" for the hospital ship *SS Hope* so far has meant Ecuador, Peru, Indonesia, and Guinea West Africa.

On board the big white Navy-loaned ship for part of its 10 months in Guinea was Dr. Elsie Wieczorowski, 932 Wolfram Street, a pediatrician with offices on Diversey Parkway.

"WOULD DO IT AGAIN"

"I learned a lot about tropical medicine and about an emerging nation," Dr. Wieczorowski said. "I would like to do it again."

Besides boning up on tropical diseases for her 2-month tour of duty off the African coast, the doctor did some intensive cramming in French, since the young country had been colonized by France, "only to find the natives don't speak it."

Project HOPE, an activity of the People to People Health Foundation, is a program of cooperation in the field of health between people in the United States and in newly developing countries.

It began in 1958 when former President Eisenhower asked a prominent Washington, D.C., physician to initiate a personal contact program to further international good will.

"HOPE" HAS STAFF OF 100

There is a staff of approximately 100 on the *SS Hope*. Besides the nurses and technicians, four are permanent, salaried doctors. The remainder are doctors working without pay, rotating on tours of 2 to 4 months.

"It's a 7-day-a-week job," said Dr. Wieczorowski. "We see about 50 to 75 patients a

day, and there is no resident staff of interns to help out.

"The people—Africans, French, Lebanese, Israeli—are wonderful to work with. They are reserved but courteous and appreciative. Most of them were peasants."

Besides treating people who came to the ship, which is anchored in the harbor of Guinea's capital, Conakry, Dr. Wieczorowski traveled by car and bicycle to the clinics set up inland for people who did not need to be hospitalized.

COMPLICATED BY MALNUTRITION

The diseases encountered by the *Hope's* staff—tuberculosis, anemia, malaria, measles, and parasites—while familiar to American doctors, were usually complicated by the peoples' malnutrition. Dr. Wieczorowski saw only children, but even they showed signs of their poor diet.

The *SS Hope* is establishing an immunization program and supplying milk to children. In touring the provinces to help set up these projects, Dr. Wieczorowski and her associates were entertained royally with feasts and dancing.

When not on general call or attending to her patients, the Chicago pediatrician visited other ships in the harbor, read, or saw movies on board.

Conakry, with a population of 80,000 is a quiet town even though it is a port. That's because the Guinea franc has no exchange value outside the country, she said. The country gained its independence 6 years ago.

COUNTRY IS RICH

"I wondered how most of the people lived," the doctor said. "There are few shops and little native industry. They are rich in natural resources—citrus fruits, coffee, aluminum—but because of their franc they have little buying power."

Most everyone grew "patches of this and that" to maintain a subsistence diet, Dr. Wieczorowski said, and some men turned out crude articles on little sewing machines.

Paint, screws, and other articles we take for granted are impossible to get, she said.

One of the most difficult things about getting on the hospital ship, besides making it to the top of the waiting list, is disposing of your own practice at home for those months, Dr. Wieczorowski said.

Notwithstanding all the difficulties, the pediatrician considers it an exciting and educational experience. "It is fascinating to be in on the political and economic growing pains of a country's beginning," she said.

AMERICAN SOLDIERS DESERVE DIGNITY IN DEATH

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the present system of notifying next of kin that a son or husband or father has been killed in action or wounded in action or is missing was instituted in the days when the Western Union Telegraph Co. delivered telegrams to the family home. Furthermore, in days gone by, the necessity for such notifications existed only in time of war, and this method was probably the most practical means of giving the sad information to relatives of servicemen killed in action.

Therefore, it was shocking and astounding to me to learn that today officials of the Western Union Telegraph Co. have adopted a policy of delivering at least some of these telegrams by telephone. This cold, heartless practice is inexcusable and an insult to every American with a loved one in the Armed Forces.

This practice came to my attention when I read a front page editorial in the Lakewood Post of Lakewood, Ohio, on July 15, 1965. The editorial, in the form of an open letter to the President, is entitled "American Soldiers Deserve Dignity in Death," and was written in protest over the fact that the parents of James A. Hall, 19, killed in action in the service of his country in Vietnam, were notified of his death by a telephone call from a stranger. I ask unanimous consent that this moving and eloquent editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT—AMERICAN SOLDIERS DESERVE DIGNITY IN DEATH

President LYNDON JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: In far off Vietnam, a courageous young man from this community was cut down by enemy fire while serving as gunner on an American helicopter.

His Lakewood mother was notified of her son's death by a Defense Department telegram which was read to her over the telephone.

We are shocked and astounded at this.

We believe that the families of young men who make the supreme sacrifice in the service of their country are entitled to a more humane and dignified notification.

The present system of notifying next of kin that a son or husband has been killed in action was instituted in the days when Western Union delivered telegrams to the family doorstep.

Since then, for reasons of economy, Western Union has adopted a policy of delivering most telegrams by telephone.

In our opinion, the information that a vibrant young man in the prime of life has been killed thousands of miles away is tragic enough without adding to the family's anguish by having it delivered routinely and impersonally by an unfamiliar voice on the telephone.

This crude and abrasive method of notifying families of military deaths is probably being used throughout the country.

Very likely, Mr. President, you are unaware of this. With all the grave burdens of responsibility and decision which rest upon your shoulders, you cannot be intimately familiar with every detail of the operations of every arm of the Federal Government.

We call this situation to your attention in the sincere hope that you will take prompt corrective action.

In our opinion, an arrangement should be made whereby the notification is made by sympathetic military personnel—not left to cold commercial channels.

Otherwise, Western Union should be required to make an actual doorstep delivery of such messages—or else the notifications should be sent by special delivery mail.

We would like to note that James A. Hall, 19, killed in action in the service of his country in Vietnam, was one of the young men honored in a "salute to servicemen" in combat zones published by this newspaper a few weeks ago.

Our object in making this "salute" was to drive home the fact that the war in Vietnam is not being fought by nameless people. When American soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen go into action, they are the boy next door, the youngster who used to work at the neighborhood filling station, the boy who was graduating from high school or college only yesterday.

These are the sons and brothers of this community and every community in the Nation.

We believe that they are entitled to the best this country can provide—the most effective military equipment available, the best training possible, the most humane treatment practical.

We also believe that their families are entitled to a dignified and humane notification should they meet the fate which every member of the Armed Forces risks in combat areas.

As this community mourns the courageous death of Jim Hall, we make this request of you, Mr. President:

Would you please look into the Defense Department's notification system, and see if you can devise a less barbarous and shocking method of informing a family of a loved one's death in the line of duty?

Young patriots like Jim Hall are entitled to at least have dignity in death.

Sincerely,

THE LAKEWOOD POST AND THE WEST SHORE POST.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, there is no valid reason why officials of the Defense Department do not insist that upon every telegram of this nature it is plainly stated: "This telegram must be delivered, not read over the telephone." If any telephoning is to be done, certainly the parents or the wife of a young man who gave his all for his country are entitled to receive the telephone call from Washington, from an official of the Defense Department, and I mean a high official, conveying the sorrowful news and the regrets of the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense speaking with sympathy and feeling over the unfortunate necessity of reporting the death.

I denounce officials of the Western Union Telegraph Co. for telephoning an important message of this sort and being the first to convey such sad news in an abrupt, businesslike manner through an anonymous person. The information that a fine young man, perhaps a teenage youngster or in his early twenties, has been killed is so tragic that surely the family's anguish should not be enhanced by receiving the information coldly and impersonally from an unfamiliar voice over the telephone.

Mr. President, a year ago an average of one American serviceman was being killed each day in Vietnam and a number wounded. Today that statistic has risen apparently fourfold. It is the hope of all of us that in the very near future no American lives will be lost on any battlefields anywhere in the world. However, events do not indicate that will be the case for some time. The least we can do is to assure our fighting men and their families that in the event that the worst does occur, they will receive a full measure of dignity in death. Thought and investigation should be given to an arrangement whereby such notifications will be made by sympathetic military personnel and not left to cold commercial channels. I urge that such a study be instituted immediately by the Secretary of Defense.

Unless this practice on the part of the Western Union Telegraph Co. is stopped immediately, I feel that high officials of

that corporation are guilty of countenancing a reprehensible practice and also doing a grave disservice to our country.

**ONE-MAN, ONE-VOTE PRINCIPLE
ENDORSED UNANIMOUSLY BY
MIDWEST DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE**

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the outstanding regional political organizations in America is the Democratic Midwest Conference, which consists of Democratic leaders from States stretching from the Rocky Mountains to the Alleghenies.

This association met in Chicago late last month and went on record, unanimously, in favor of the one-man, one-vote, apportionment of State legislative bodies. In a resolution which is concise but hardhitting, and is without reservations, the organization specifically affirmed the Supreme Court decision in *Reynolds* against *Sims*. I stress the fact that this organization unanimously approved this position.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**RESOLUTION BY DEMOCRATIC MIDWEST
CONFERENCE**

Whereas the democratic principle of equal representation in State legislative bodies has been eloquently affirmed by the Supreme Court in the case of *Reynolds v. Sims*, in which it said that "to the extent that a citizen's right to vote is debased, he is that much less a citizen"; and

Whereas the vast migration of our population has transformed our Nation from a predominantly rural to a largely suburban and urban character, which has brought with it new and different kinds of challenges to our legislative process; and

Whereas the adamant refusal of many State legislatures to reapportion themselves in the face of constitutional mandates has created an indifference to the problems of urban areas and the atrophy of strong State government and State initiative in solving urban problems; and

Whereas the provision of Senate Joint Resolution 2, that "factors other than population" may be used to apportion one house of a State legislature is vague and opens the door to discrimination against groups of voters such as Negroes and the poor, and consequently endangers the gains promised by the Voting Rights Act of 1965: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Midwest Democratic Conference meeting in Chicago, on June 26, 1965, That we oppose any effort to negate the Supreme Court decision on State legislative apportionment and urge all Midwest Congressmen and Senators to oppose and vote against any measure designed to dilute or overturn this historic affirmation of the democratic principle of fair representation.

**THE 47TH YEAR OF SERVICE TO
CONGRESS BY EUGENE T. KINNALLY, OF MASSACHUSETTS**

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I extend my personal best wishes to Eugene T. Kinnally, a distinguished son of Massa-

chusetts, as he enters his 47th year of service to the Congress of the United States.

Gene Kinnally began his career on the Hill in 1918 as secretary to the late Representative James A. Gallivan and 10 years later went on to become administrative assistant to the present Speaker of the House, JOHN W. MCCORMACK. For more than three and a half decades, he has been a tireless and dedicated friend and trusted adviser to Speaker McCormack. What is more, his knowledge of the legislative process and his rational, reassuring, and openminded approach to issues and problems has won him the friendship, respect, and appreciation of countless legislators, regardless of their partisan preference. Here is a man whose record of service is outstanding, not simply because of its duration but because of its enviable quality. For this reason, Mr. President, "thanks," even more than "congratulations" are in order—thanks to a man whose distinctly admirable service has transcended the narrow bounds of partisanship; thanks to a man whose term of service is not only remarkable but exemplary.

Mr. President, what I have said applies to me on a highly personal basis as a Member of Senate for the past 20 years.

**ANNUAL MEMORIAL SERVICES BY
SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION
AT GRAVESIDE OF ELBRIDGE
GERRY, FOURTH VICE
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES**

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on July 5, 1965, the District of Columbia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution held services at the graveside of Elbridge Gerry, fourth Vice President of the United States. Annually they gather at the Congressional Cemetery to pay tribute to this distinguished statesman.

Gerry was born in Marblehead, Mass., graduated from Harvard College in 1762, and joined his family in the mercantile business in a time infused with revolutionary spirit. In May 1772, he began his political career as an elected representative to the General Court of Massachusetts. He was reelected in 1773, and in 1774 was elected to the first Provincial Congress, which appointed him to the executive Committee on Safety. In this position he worked with John Hancock and Samuel Adams making preparations which helped bring about the success at the Battle of Lexington and Concord.

In 1776 he was elected to Congress, where he soon established a reputation for integrity, conscientiousness, industriousness, and implacable opposition to England.

At the Federal Convention of 1787, Gerry was one of the most experienced and active members. As chairman of the committee that prepared the "great compromise," he was instrumental in bringing about final agreement on the Constitution. His own fears that the Constitution would fail to secure liberty,

however, prevented him from voicing support for the document until 1789. Again elected to Congress, Gerry was given the opportunity to provide the Constitution with a Bill of Rights, thus satisfying his original doubts about the Constitution.

Although he retired temporarily, Gerry returned to public service in 1797 to accompany Marshall and Pinckney on the "XYZ mission" to France. In 1810 he was elected Governor of Massachusetts, a position he held until 1812, when he was nominated as Vice President on the ticket with James Madison. His long political career came to an end on November 23, 1814, when he was seized by a hemorrhage of the lungs on his way to the Senate Chamber.

In honor of his long career of public service and his consistent respect for integrity, I join the District Sons of the Revolution in paying tribute to Elbridge Gerry—Massachusetts legislator, Massachusetts Governor, U.S. legislator, fourth Vice President of the United States.

**IMPROVEMENTS IN THE UNEMPLOYMENT
COMPENSATION SYSTEM**

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I am pleased that at a recent meeting of the National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress, the members recommended improvements in the unemployment compensation system and gave general endorsement of the bill which I and several other Senators have introduced in the Senate (S. 991) and which Representative WILBUR MILLS introduced in the House of Representatives (H.R. 8282).

The National Commission was established by an act of Congress last year. It has been given the responsibility to make a broad assessment of the effects of change and automation on production and employment and also on communities affected by technological change.

The 14 members of the Commission appointed by President Johnson are: Chairman: Dr. Howard R. Bowen, president, University of Iowa; Mr. Joseph A. Beirne, president, Communications Workers of America; Mr. Albert J. Hayes, president, International Association of Machinists; Mr. Whitney Young, executive director, National Urban Leagues; Mr. Robert M. Solow, professor of economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Mr. Daniel Bell, chairman, Sociology Department, Columbia University; Mr. Benjamin Aaron, visiting professor, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University; Mr. Robert H. Ryan, president, Regional Industrial Development Corporation of Southwestern Pennsylvania; Mr. Thomas Watson, chairman of the board, IBM; Mr. Patrick E. Haggerty, president, Texas Instruments, Inc.; Mrs. Anna Rosenberg Hoffman, president, Anna M. Rosenberg Associates; Mr. Edwin Land, president and research director, Polaroid Corp.; Mr. Philip Sporn, chairman, System Development Committee, American Electric

Power Co.; Mr. Walter P. Reuther, president, United Automobile Workers.

The Ways and Means Committee of the House has scheduled hearings on H.R. 8282, to begin in early August. The endorsement of the National Commission is additional evidence of the need for improvement in the basic unemployment insurance law, and I am hopeful that we can accomplish this in the 89th Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the press statement regarding the endorsement of the National Commission be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMISSION ENDORSES UPDATING OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE LAWS

The National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, meeting here this week, endorsed the essence of S. 1991 and H.R. 8282, which update the unemployment insurance laws.

The Commission, in a resolution passed during its meeting, said: "The Commission endorses wholeheartedly and recommends action by the Congress to provide clearly needed improvements in the unemployment compensation laws."

The resolution said: "The unemployment insurance system of the Nation has two basic purposes:

"1. It is a primary means of support to the millions of persons displaced each year by the technological and other changes which occur in the economy.

"2. It is an important automatic stabilizer, adding support to both local economies and the national economy whenever business activity slackens."

The National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress is charged by Congress and the President with the duty to assess the impact of technological change and recommend actions to share the costs and help prevent and alleviate the adverse impacts of change on displaced workers.

The Commission heartily recommended congressional action to update the unemployment insurance laws to increase benefit levels; lengthen benefit periods; extend coverage to more jobs; implement Federal standards so that workers will receive adequate protection throughout the Nation.

APPOINTMENT OF LEONARD MARKS AS HEAD OF U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, President Johnson is to be congratulated for his appointment of Leonard Harold Marks as head of the U.S. Information Agency. I have come to know Mr. Marks well, during my years in Washington, and I am sure that he will fulfill his duties with great distinction. I ask unanimous consent to have a biographical sketch of Mr. Marks which appeared in the July 14 issue of the New York Times printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW VOICE OF THE UNITED STATES—LEONARD HAROLD MARKS

WASHINGTON, July 13.—In its 12-year history the U.S. Information Agency has been headed by a professional diplomat, a political

philosopher, a successful journalist, and a famous broadcaster. Today President Johnson chose as its new Director, charged with the vexing assignment of explaining America to the world, Leonard Harold Marks, a bouncy, brilliant 49-year-old lawyer. "Since the age of 16," Mr. Marks observed today, "I've done nothing else but work in communications."

The fascination with the techniques, economics, and legal problems of amplifying men's thoughts has carried him from Pittsburgh, where he was born March 5, 1916, to Washington, where he combined a variety of public-interest assignments with a highly successful private law practice.

Among his more famous clients was radio-television station KTBC in Austin, Tex., key-stone of the broadcasting empire built by Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson and now administered by her trustees.

The relationship between the Marks and Johnson families is an intimate one. Mr. Marks was the President's personal representative in planning the inauguration this year. Mrs. Marks was enlisted by Mrs. Johnson's move from their private residence into the White House in the autumn of 1963.

BOTH MEN GREGARIOUS

The President and his new information chief were compared to each other by a Washington hostess who has entertained both frequently. "They're both gregarious men," she said, "but they're not frivolous. You could look around for Leonard or Lyndon, and they were always off in a corner, talking business."

Information Agency officials, who think access to top policymakers is the key to success for their Director, are hopeful that the closeness of the personal relationship augurs well.

The new Director was graduated from the University of Pittsburgh at 19, received a law degree from its law school 3 years later and taught law there for 4 years.

In 1942, he began a 4-year assignment as assistant to the general counsel to the Federal Communications Commission. In 1946, Mr. Marks and his chief at the agency, Marcus Cohn, founded the law firm of Cohn & Marks, now the largest in Washington dealing exclusively with communications cases. Mrs. Johnson's station was among its first clients.

From his early days on the FCC staff, Mr. Marks had an interest in developing broadcasting by frequency modulation, or FM. More recently he has been involved in obtaining channels and financial support for educational television stations.

President Kennedy named him in 1962 to the founding board of the Communications Satellite Corp.; he was formally elected as a public member of its board of directors in 1964.

Mr. Marks has traveled extensively abroad, as a member and adviser of U.S. delegations to international communications conferences. He has also traveled to India and Pakistan under State Department auspices, explaining American broadcasting techniques and the role and responsibility of a free press.

In 1948, Mr. Marks married the former Dorothy Ames, a onetime reporter for Variety and other newspapers. They have two teenage sons, Stephen and Robert.

The Marks have a home in Georgetown and this summer are renting a small home on the Glen Ora estate at Middleburg, Va., that President Kennedy and his family leased 3 years ago.

An indifferent sportsman who has trouble defeating his wife at table tennis, Mr. Marks is a leading figure in the Potomac Marching Society, a dinner-dance group. A short man, he has been described by one friend as "having the kind of a face that can never look unhappy."

REPORT ON HUMPHREY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, few men who have held the office of Vice President of the United States have served with the energy and ability which have characterized HUBERT HUMPHREY's period as Vice President. Recently, Roscoe Drummond wrote a fine article reporting on the Vice President's many activities and his close working relationship with President Johnson. I ask unanimous consent to have this article, as published in the Washington Post, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON HUMPHREY: OUTLOOK IS REASSURING

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Hardly a day passes that some commentator does not give us a report on the state of L.B.J. In sophisticated Washington he is sometimes judged only by the style of his actions; in the country he is judged by the substance of his actions; history will judge him by the results of his actions.

For the most part the reports are favorable. The President is feeling well, he is doing well, and is filling his office to the brim and running over.

What about the Vice President? How is HUBERT H. HUMPHREY in the role for which Lyndon Johnson carefully picked him?

It is a critical, crucial, difficult role and Mr. Johnson chose him to be ready to become President if the necessity arose. The President knew how suddenly that necessity could come.

I am not attempting to appraise HUMPHREY as a possible presidential nominee. There are too many imponderables in that equation to judge. But I want to report two aspects of the vice-presidency that are immensely reassuring:

1. The President is giving HUMPHREY the largest opportunities ever given a Vice President to be ready to take up the Presidency.

2. HUMPHREY is responding to these opportunities in ways that reassure those who work with him.

HUMPHREY is, of course, not making the policies nor the decisions of the Government. No Vice President ever does and no Johnson Vice President would ever think of it. But HUMPHREY is often a participant in policy formulation and is kept by the President at the center of decisionmaking.

The President constantly uses HUMPHREY on a wide range of domestic and foreign policy matters. HUMPHREY is a valuable legislative troubleshooter, he is active in supervising the diverse space program and in coordinating the work of all Federal agencies in carrying out the civil rights laws.

There is no one in Washington today—outside L.B.J. himself—who knows as much about all that the Government is doing, all that the President is thinking and planning, and all he faces, as HUBERT HUMPHREY.

This shows how completely intent Mr. Johnson is in protecting against the worst. It is mighty encouraging when you recall that when Vice President Truman suddenly had everything crash down upon him, he had never once been invited to the White House to talk things over with F.D.R.

But what is HUMPHREY doing with his opportunities? Is he using them well in order to be ready if the need arises? My information is that on the things that count most he is using them exceedingly well. These are the vital matters:

Intelligence: The Vice President is not taking it easy. He puts in an 18-hour day nearly 7 days a week. The light at his bed-

side never goes out until he has finished studying every scrap of CIA and other intelligence. When the next day starts HUBERT is up to date.

Security: The Vice President has deliberately acquainted himself not only with the Joint Chiefs of Staff but with the second and third echelons of the armed services. He respects them. They respect him. They knew he is neither soft nor appeasement-minded. They know he knows the Nation's security requirements.

The economy: The Vice President is a political liberal whose views have often found the bitterest opposition in the business community. But HUMPHREY's liberalism is tempered by experience and responsibility. He will probably never be the hero of the business community, but businessmen now have reasons to know that HUMPHREY believes profoundly in competitive enterprise and the profit incentive, knows how important risk capital is to growth and jobs, and wants no animus between Government and business.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the position of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade with respect to S. 268 and S. 1118 before the Senate District of Columbia Committee hearings on home rule.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSITION OF THE METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON BOARD OF TRADE WITH RESPECT TO S. 268 AND S. 1118, 89TH CONGRESS

(Submitted for the record, Senate District of Columbia hearings on home rule, Mar. 19, 1965)

The District of Columbia form of government and the question of suffrage for District of Columbia residents have received continuous attention in the Board of Trade for more than half a century. Forty-nine years ago, in 1916, the Board adopted a policy favoring national representation for the District of Columbia. We have engaged in extensive activities in furtherance of that objective for many years and continue to do so today. We believe the Board has great competence to comment on the bills under discussion—much more than some of the agencies and organizations and persons currently articulating loudly and frequently about the District of Columbia form of government.

Most business, professional, and recognized civic leaders of Washington since 1889 have been members of the Board of Trade. A large number of community leaders in the Federal City today are members and have served as chairmen of its committees. Our Board of Directors and officers, a list of which is attached, is certainly composed of men of proven ability and judgment as well as men whom you will recognize as having been leaders in many important civic enterprises. We believe the committee will agree that this group of Washingtonians is well qualified to discuss local matters. One additional observation to this point—the presidents, directors, and leaders in the Board of Trade have always been men whose lives have been intimately identified with this community. A large majority of the men who have served as presidents of the Board of Trade have been natives of this community. We believe this is important in that it demonstrates that the Board of Trade may speak from a leadership experience which is preeminent in this city.

So there will be no misunderstanding, let it be recorded that the members of the Board of Trade and the Board of Trade as an orga-

nization fully subscribe to the basic American democratic philosophy. We believe that all Americans, including those residing in the Federal City, should have a voice in their government through selecting officials who govern them. This is clearly demonstrated by our active interest in securing for the people of the District a vote for President and Vice President. The Board of Trade was the prime mover in this effort which owes much of its success to the Board's vigorous activity at the time of its adoption and for some years previous.

The Board of Trade in its positive direction, is still seeking for the people of the District representation in the Congress which under the Constitution is and must continue to be the agency invested with the exclusive power to govern the District of Columbia.

We wish to emphatically note—for the committee's information—that the Board's opposition to home rule is not based on racial considerations. We opposed similar home rule proposals a half century ago when the nonwhite population of the District was just over 25 percent. We feel that we would continue to support such a policy even if the nonwhite population were a much lower percentage. This statement is made here in view of the frequent practice by some ardent home rule supporters of maligning the Board of Trade and disparaging its judgment in this matter for being racially motivated.

Now despite our conclusion that home rule as detailed in S. 268, S. 1118, and similar bills should not be enacted, we do wish to record the quite obvious fact that if the Congress does provide a District of Columbia government of this nature, the Board of Trade will energetically lend its efforts to perfecting the organization and operation of such a new government.

Our basic objective is to make of the Nation's Capital the finest community in the world in which to live, work, and raise our families. This we have endeavored to do for 75 years, despite a number of handicapping local conditions, and we will continue to do so to the best of our ability under whatever circumstances prevail.

We and many, many thousands of other District residents as well as countless other Americans who have taken the trouble to thoroughly inform themselves with respect to the unique situation in the Federal City are opposed to the passage of S. 268 and S. 1118 and other bills tagged as "home rule" bills because we conclude that if adopted, they would not produce meaningful "home rule" government and that their enactment would be extremely injurious to the best interests of the Federal City and the United States of America.

Our basic premise respecting the District of Columbia's character is that its primary purpose is to serve as the seat of Government of the United States. It was designed and developed for that purpose and should continue to serve that purpose. This premise, to which we believe the Congress overwhelmingly subscribes, imposes a host of very special and unusual characteristics and requirements not present in other cities.

To get a true picture of Washington and its problems, it is necessary to turn back the pages of history to the early 1790's and trace the city's development through the years. Section 8, article I, of the Constitution of the United States provides that Congress shall exercise exclusive legislation over such district (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of Government of the United States.

An act of Congress of July 16, 1790, accepted the 10-mile square of land lying on both sides of the Potomac River which the States of Maryland and Virginia had ceded for this purpose in 1783 and 1789, respectively. The act further directed the President to ap-

point three commissioners to survey, limit and locate the city and, prior to the first Monday in December 1800, provide suitable buildings for the accommodation of Congress and the President, and for public offices of the Government of the United States.

An act of Congress, approved April 24, 1800, authorized the President of the United States to direct the removal of various executive departments to the city of Washington from Philadelphia. The first meeting of the Congress in the new Capital was held on November 21, 1800, by which time President John Adams had moved to the White House. By June 16, 1801, all personnel and records had been moved to the new seat of government.

The first government of the city of Washington (then only the central portion of the District) was established after its incorporation by an act of Congress in 1802. The government consisted of a mayor appointed by the President and a 12-member City Council elected by the people of the city. The Council, by vote of its members, was divided into an upper house of seven members and a lower house of five. The right to vote for Federal officeholders ceased in December, 1800.

In 1812, Congress amended the charter of Washington by providing for an elected Board of Aldermen of 8 members and an elected Board of Common Council of 12 members. The Mayor was elected by joint vote of the 2 boards.

Eight years later in 1820, the charter was changed again. This time it provided for the same Board of Aldermen and Board of Common Council but with a Mayor elected by the qualified voters for a term of 2 years. This form of city government continued for 50 years.

By an act of Congress of February 21, 1871, a territorial form of government was provided for the District consisting of a Governor, a Board of Public Works, a Board of Health, and a Legislative Assembly consisting of an 11-member Council and a 22-member House of Delegates. The Board of Public Works consisted of the Governor and four persons, one of which was a civil engineer. The Governor, the Council members, and the Board of Public Works were appointed by the President. The members of the House of Delegates were elected by the qualified voters. There was also an elected Delegate to the House of Representatives of the United States with a right to speak but not to vote.

This form of government which closely resembles one of those advocated again today lasted only 3 years. On June 20, 1874, it was abolished by an act of Congress which established a temporary commissioner form of government and appointed a committee of two Senators and two Representatives to draft "a suitable frame of government for the District of Columbia." Following a report of this committee, the temporary government was abolished by the act of June 11, 1878, which created the present three-commissioner form of government with the Engineer Commissioner appointed from the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army. Our present government, which has survived for 87 years, can be said to have been arrived at by the "trial and error" method since it evolved after rejection by the Congress of the 1802, 1812, 1820, 1871, and 1874 types of government.

So much for history and so much for experience. There are those who will say that things are different now, that this fabulous electronic and space age has created a whole new set of circumstances which make it impossible to measure the present and the future by the past. So, let us enumerate a few of the unique situations in this Federal City which, we believe, discredit the contention that it should have the same form of government as other cities.

1. It is the first city ever to be conceived, born and raised as the Capital City of a major nation with no other reason for existence.

2. At the time of its birth, it was divorced from local political pressures by being located on land ceded from the adjoining States.

3. The Constitution of the United States reserves to the Congress the right to legislate for the "City of the Nation." Regardless of the type of government enjoyed by the local people, its governing officials, whether they be commissioners or a governor or a mayor, can "regulate" only under the overriding legislative control of the Congress.

4. The Federal Government owns 43.1 percent of the taxable land in the District of Columbia.

5. Foreign embassies and tax free organizations (many specifically declared tax free by the Congress) occupy another 7 percent.

6. Since District governmental activities occupy 4.1 percent of the taxable land, the total of these exemptions is 54.2 percent.

7. Our major business—the Federal Government—pays no income tax, sales tax, personal property tax, or real estate tax. Elsewhere business does pay these taxes roughly at the rate of \$1 for each \$20 of payroll.

8. Our parks are administered by the National Park Service.

9. Our Board of Education, appointed by the the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, is an independent agency reporting to the Commissioners only on budgetary matters.

10. Our judges are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

11. Our Zoning Commission has two ex officio Federal officers on it—the Director of the National Park Service and the Architect of the Capitol.

12. The National Capital Planning Commission with the Engineer Commissioner as an ex officio member is appointed by the President and reports not to the city fathers but to the White House.

13. Our Public Utilities Commission, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, except the Engineer Commissioner who serves ex officio is an independent agency reporting to the Commissioners only on budgetary matters.

14. The Board of Commissioners is charged with preparing an annual balanced budget. The only taxes which can be raised or lowered by them are real estate and tangible personal property taxes.

15. The District of Columbia budget, after review by the Federal Bureau of the Budget, is presented to the Congress by the President in his annual budget message.

16. The District of Columbia government performs all the functions of a city, county, and State. Insofar as the Federal highway aid and most other Federal aid programs are concerned, it is classified as a State and receives its share of interstate money.

17. Its income is deposited in the U.S. Treasury and can be withdrawn only for payment of budget items approved by the Congress.

18. The Corps of Engineers of the Army is responsible for water supply and purification but the distribution is the responsibility of the District government.

19. The District of Columbia National Guard reports directly to the President who is the Commander in Chief. The Federal Government appoints the commanding general and exercises control over the Guard in a manner similar to State governments.

20. Federal Civil Service Commission rules, regulations, and eligibility lists apply equally to many District employees.

21. The District furnishes the Federal Government certain basic municipal services such as fire and police protection and water, sewer and sanitation services.

These 21 items all add up to a complicated Federal-city relationship. Some of these conditions would be changed if any of these so-called home rule bills were enacted into law, but the significant ones would remain as is. Of the 21 points cited just a few—perhaps half a dozen—would be altered through passage of S. 268 or S. 1118 and they are not the most important ones.

The Board of Trade's long experience with Congress on District of Columbia budget and legislative matters has led us to the firm conclusion that the transfer of revenue and budget functions to a locally elected council or legislative assembly would be accompanied by the shrinkage of the presently increasing but still inadequate Federal payment. Support for this conclusion was voiced during the 86th Congress (as it has been many times) during the debate on the floor of the House of Representatives when the District of Columbia budget was being considered.

In response to questions from the floor, Congressman RHODES of Arizona had this to say,

"Personally, as far as home rule is concerned and as it concerns the fiscal position of the city of Washington, I would venture to say that if the city of Washington had home rule, it would be treated the same as any other State in the United States is treated insofar as Federal payments are concerned. In other words, if we are speaking only of the fiscal situation, it would be my thought that probably the city of Washington would lose whatever Federal payment that it now receives except insofar as those payments are for services rendered * * * I doubt very much whether the Congress would be inclined to pay annually to the District of Columbia \$22 million, \$25 million, or \$30 million or whatever figure it might be any more than it would be inclined to pay the city of New York, for instance, payments in lieu of property taxes for the Federal installations."

The District of Columbia cannot be developed, operated, and maintained by those living and doing business within its borders. Only 45.8 percent of the land is taxed; its largest employer, the U.S. Government, is completely tax free. To attempt to levy the total District budget on residents and commercial activities would place an unconscionable burden on the people far in excess of that demanded anywhere else, including Maryland and Virginia. Of even greater practical importance is the fact that neither the tax-paying residents nor businesses could long shoulder such burdens. Consequently, many of them would inevitably remove themselves to other jurisdictions. Thus there would be an acceleration of the outward movement of businesses and residents who pay taxes in excess of municipal expenditures on their behalf, accompanied by a depreciation in property values and a reduction in business volumes. This cycle of deterioration is well understood, hence, the end result is predictable. Through this means would be created exactly the same situation in which Congress found the District of Columbia in the early 1870's and which resulted in the commissioner form of government and the establishment of a fixed Federal payment. The outlook under these "home rule" bills is a distressing fiscal problem which we conclude ardent advocates of this legislation do not recognize.

Many articulate local residents base their support for so-called "home rule" on the contention that our shortage of money problems respecting schools, welfare, public health, and other social matters are a result of inaction of the uninformed or unsympathetic or stingy Congress. They state that "home rule" would solve these problems. We vigorously disagree with such statements. We conclude that these problems would be compounded.

Under the proposed bills the Congress would not adopt District of Columbia budgets. We conclude that this would make the District more dependent on local taxes and that the Federal payment would certainly become a smaller portion of available annual revenues.

We in the Board of Trade and, we believe, most thinking practical people accept the inescapable hard economic fact that no community can develop and be operated properly without a prosperous and solid economic base. Fiscal health is certainly a primary requisite for the Capital of this great Nation.

We foresee that the enactment of any of these bills would result in an intolerable conflict of interest between the local people and the U.S. Government. If one of them is passed, there would be repetitions of the same misunderstandings which characterized the period from 1800 to 1878.

As it did on more than one occasion in that period the Congress would take action on vital issues directly opposed to the action of the council or the will of the people.

Though we favor the formula for determining the annual Federal payment included in S. 1118, we seriously doubt that the Congress will enact either it or a reasonable fixed percentage as it did in 1878.

In the absence of a fixed figure or an orderly manner of arriving at an equitable Federal payment, there would result inevitably a situation where the local government would refrain from major public works commitments with the contention that it was a Federal responsibility. The Congress would in many cases refuse to acknowledge such responsibility until conditions became so horrible that they would have to deal with them just as in the case of the water supply and other facilities in the 1800's.

The inevitable result of these situations would be that the local community would be in constant contention with the Congress and that seekers of local political offices would undoubtedly construct their platforms in varying degrees on anti-U.S. Government local issues.

We dislike injecting such conclusions in the record of these hearings but we believe they are sound. We believe the committee should be informed of the thinking of an intensely interested group of leaders in this community and we conclude that the results of the enactment of the legislation under consideration would be so injurious to the Federal city that we would be remiss in our responsibility if we did not review these matters here.

While we will not review the details of the bills under consideration, I do want to refer to one section of S. 268 which, in our opinion, is completely undesirable and which relates to the fiscal situation which we have been discussing.

Section 806 of S. 268 defines qualified electors as "any person (1) who has maintained a domicile or place of abode in the District continuously during the 1-year period ending on the day of the election, (2) who is a citizen of the United States, (3) who is on the day of the election at least 21 years old, (4) who has never been convicted of a felony in the United States, or if he has been so convicted, has been pardoned, (5) who is not mentally incompetent as adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction, and (6) who certifies that he has not within 1 year immediately preceding the election, voted in any election at which candidates for any municipal offices (other than in the District of Columbia) were on the ballot." Then the bill provides that the District may issue bonds of indebtedness provided their issuance receives a favorable vote of the qualified electors.

The Washington Board of Trade has in every hearing on home rule bills vigorously opposed the dual voting provision through which persons residing in the District,

though retaining and exercising their right to vote in other jurisdictions, may vote in the District if they have not voted in a municipal election during the preceding year. We hold that it is unfair to those exclusively citizens of the District to permit voters in other jurisdictions, many of whom intend to return to their home in the States next year, the year after, or at some time in the future, to participate in referendums authorizing the creation of large amounts of bonded indebtedness, secure in the knowledge that they will not participate in paying these debts.

Denying the vote only to those who have participated in an election when municipal officials were on the ballot is a principle which is incomprehensible to us. The District of Columbia performs substantially all the functions of a State, county, municipality, and school district. Why then only exclude those voting for municipal officials? Why not also State and county officials? If this were done it would, of course, eliminate as qualified electors in the District all those who voted in other jurisdictions and thus reserve participation in elections including the approval of bond issues to those people who firmly acknowledge the District of Columbia as their permanent home. S. 1118 does not include this objectionable language.

The Board of Trade has steadily maintained that national representation is an essential feature of true "home rule" for residents of the District. Excerpts from the testimony before the House Judiciary Committee in 1928 by Henry Glassie, then Special Assistant to the Attorney General, clearly express our reasoning in support of this statement. Mr. Glassie said:

"What was the claim of the Americans to full participation before the Revolution? Participation in local government? Not at all. They had that. It was participation in that sovereign imperial parliament which made the law.

"We have been reproached with the idea that we do not want local government and therefore do not want self-government. But mark the distinction. Local government may be a mere matter of municipal administration. But what self-government means is that the people who are to obey the laws shall have a share in the making of the laws. You (the Congress) make the law. Under the constitutional provisions you will always make the law. Under the principle that the Federal Government shall be supreme, you must continue to make the law.

"Therefore, when we come to you humbly, and say, 'Admit us to participate; admit us to your councils in the making of this law,' we are asking for local self-government.

"So I say to you, gentlemen, with profound deference, that these things, first from one side and then from the other, which are constantly thrown against us, will hardly bear scrutiny. We do want self-government, and the essence of self-government is the right to send a man from your community into the legislative representative body which can send you to war, tax your property, do what it pleases with your will, control your domestic relations, your relations with your family, your wife and children and do all those things which make a government, a government touching intimately the life of the community. Those are the things that are dearest to you and those are the things which, in your respective States, you insist upon having, and which you will never surrender."

We wish to express to the committee our appreciation for this opportunity to present our views.

WHO'S AN EXTREMIST?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have received a copy of an address given

recently in Los Angeles by Alan Cranston, controller of the State of California.

Mr. Cranston spoke on extremism, both of the right and the left. In his address he reviews the history of extremism and cites numerous examples from contemporary society. He emphasizes that the remedy is not in attempting to suppress ideas or in limiting free speech in our society, but to meet the efforts of extremists with truth.

I believe his speech itself is an example of what he recommends at the end of his address:

The time has come, I think, for all Americans—liberals, moderates and conservatives, the press and the churches, business and labor—to isolate, point out, and reject totally the extremism on both sides of us, the conspiracy theories, the ends-justify-the-means philosophy, the authoritarian contempt for our democracy, the hatred and the bigotry.

I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO'S AN EXTREMIST?

(By State Controller Alan Cranston to Town Hall, Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, on July 13, 1965)

One morning, not too long ago, two bulky pieces of mail landed on my desk in Sacramento.

The first envelope contained a copy of Progressive Labor, a monthly published by the extremely leftwing Progressive Labor Party.

The magazine told me that we Americans live in a Fascist state, that President Johnson and Walter Reuther are among its conspiratorial leaders and stooges, and that President Kennedy was assassinated by the big business, police state machine.

It said that all America would know this, if the press were not controlled.

The second envelope contained a packet of material published by the extremely rightwing John Birch Society.

This material told me that we Americans live in a Communist state, that President Johnson and Walter Reuther are among its conspiratorial leaders and stooges, and that President Kennedy was assassinated by the Communists, for not being a good enough Communist.

It said that all America would know this, if the press were not controlled.

Funny-coincidence department?

I don't think so.

And I'd like to spend the next few minutes exploring why, in some detail.

There is a virus in our land.

Highly contagious, it has existed throughout history, throughout the world—often dormant, sometimes epidemic, and occasionally fatal.

It will always exist to some extent in a free society, where ideas and judgments—even the false and the execrable—may be voiced, with relative impunity.

But these days in America, and especially in California, the virus is severe, far reaching, and menacing.

The virus is extremism.

Very few, to my knowledge, have really attempted to isolate this virus—to define, simply and precisely, just what extremism is, today.

To all too many, I believe, it has not been made sufficiently clear, once and for all, why extremism is essentially wrong and essentially dangerous.

As a foreign correspondent in Mussolini's Italy and Hitler's Germany in the 1930's, I

saw extremism close up, both in its budding and in its fullest and ugliest flourishing.

In the mad world of Adolf Hitler, I saw Jews herded off to concentration camps, on the harsh road to the ovens of Auschwitz.

In Ethiopia, I witnessed 20th century slavery—Fascist style. I saw black women flogged for failing to salute white men in black shirts.

Years later, I saw the same hatred and inhumanity in Birmingham, where I walked the streets with Martin Luther King in the dark and bitter winter of 1957, when white men were throwing bombs at black men.

In short, I have long studied the virus of extremism, and I have always been deeply concerned whenever and wherever its symptoms have appeared—especially in America and particularly in California.

Moreover, as I've examined extremist propaganda, left and right, over the years, I've been struck by the many parallels and common characteristics.

In sum, I believe the virus can be isolated.

An extremist is, I think, basically and above all a zealous believer in a fanciful notion that an evil conspiracy controls or is close to controlling our land—our Government, our press, our schools, our churches; indeed, almost every aspect of our lives.

To take some further examples from the hard right:

To the followers of Carl McIntire, a deposed Presbyterian minister and now an anti-Catholic radio star of the far right, our churches are Communist-dominated, the press is "leftist and Vatican controlled," ad infinitum.

To the followers of Dan Smoot, civil defense programing is planned dictatorship, urban renewal a plot toward a Soviet America, and so on and so on.

To the followers of Gerald L. K. Smith and his anti-Semitic Christian Nationalist Crusade, the Supreme Court, the income tax, and the United Nations are only a few of the tools of the Kremlin.

To the followers of the White Citizens Councils, mental health programs, the Ford Foundation, and civil rights laws, among a good deal else, are all Communist cabals.

To the followers of the Minutemen, everything from Martin Luther King to Life, Look, and the Saturday Evening Post is part of the great conspiracy.

To the followers of H. L. Hunt's Life Line Foundation, America's mutual security program was devised by no less than Joseph Stalin—in the 1920's—and Life Line goes on in a very big way from there.

And to the followers of Robert Welch and the John Birch Society, the CIA, NATO, and De Gaulle are just three of thousands of Communist schemes and schemers.

That doesn't leave much of America, or the free world, uncontrolled—except, possibly, the Beatles.

By now, to the followers of the Birch leader, Billy James Hargis, and his own Christian Crusade, now even the Beatles have been revealed as Communist agents, out to brainwash us all via rock 'n roll.

(While, I might add, on the other side of the world, in Sukarno's Indonesia, a man has just been arrested as a subversive—for playing Beatles records.)

All this, I think, is extremist doctrine, pure and simple.

These leaders and groups of the extreme right are only a few of hundreds upon hundreds who are flooding Californians and Americans with their propaganda at an unprecedented rate, through newspapers, via radio, over television, by films, tapes, maps, meetings, brochures, pamphlets, books, fliers, long-playing records, and even bumper strips.

In fact, a partisan of this sort of thing can just about dial the extremist of his choice on radio and television in California, on almost any given day and at almost any given time.

And there are indications, sometimes, that quite a few of the faithful do just that—all day long.

The evidence indicates that more than 3,000 such groups in America are now doing a \$30 million a year business in rightwing extremism.

For comparative purposes, Government evidence indicates that the Communist Party, at its peak, never got much further than raising \$1 million a year in the United States.

And the Progressive Labor Party, the most vociferous and potentially contagious new voice on the hard left these days, with its Peiping brand of radicalism, has an estimated 500 members, with a treasury, perhaps, commensurate with its size.

In contrast, the Birch Society alone spent an estimated \$3 million last year and now is aiming at adding 38,000 new members, just in California. Its leader, Robert Welch, deems the soil of California so fertile that he plans to spend half his time among us.

Still another rightwing extremist, Carl McIntire—the anti-Catholic radio preacher of whom the vast majority of Americans may not yet have heard—grossed an estimated \$1.5 million, at least, in 1964. Which puts him far, far ahead of a much better known evangelist of the hard right, Billy James Hargis.

The point is not to belittle the Communist Party or other extreme leftwing splinter groups in America, as long as their support depends, in varying degrees, upon a tremendous and treacherous element not present in the extreme rightwing: Allegiance or subservience to a foreign power.

In a strange way, this element is at one and the same time a source of strength and a cause of weakness for the extremists of the left. Their relationship to the Soviet Union and/or China automatically directs a great deal of unsympathetic attention to their activities. The absence of any such alien and hostile ties on the part of the extremists of the right causes a comparative lack of concern about their doings.

The point is, I think, that inside America, and within the fabric of our own society, the extreme right has by far the more power, prestige, and potential to become a force, rather than a factor, in our land.

But all of this vast propaganda activity, though worthy of our deep concern, is not, to me, the most immediate, serious danger.

I have confidence that the great majority of Americans have the innate good sense to reject flatly the patent silliness from the screwball set, right or left.

One very real danger, I believe, is this: An extremist believes and practices the philosophy that the ends justify the means.

This follows naturally from extremists doctrine, for if a person believes that our land is in the clutches of an awesome, evil conspiracy, he will feel called upon to take almost any action to fight it—

From hounding librarians and teachers to bullying editors and public officials, to forming cell groups and secret platoons, to boycotting businesses and infiltrating organizations, to breaking up meetings and training in the hills.

Actually, to the extremist, this is simply patriotism of the highest order—well meant, but deadly dangerous.

Another fundamental characteristic of the extremists is their loss of faith, if they ever had it, in the institutions of our Nation and in our democratic processes. They are not legitimate conservatives or liberals in any sense. They can never be. They are prepared to operate wholly outside the bounds of our American tradition.

It's no happenstance that to Robert Welch on the far right—and these are his words—"democracy is merely a deceptive phrase, a weapon of demagoguery, and a perennial fraud."

Or that, to quote again from Welch in his society's Blue Book: "The John Birch Society is to be a monolithic body. * * * The John Birch Society will operate under complete authoritarian control at all levels."

It's no happenstance, either, that, on the far left, the Progressive Labor Party, for example, calls for "a revolutionary dictatorship of armed workers" and considers our American democracy to be a farce. "Fascism" is their word for it.

Genuine conservatives and genuine liberals believe in honest debate over the many sides of an issue and are then willing to leave the decision to the will of the majority—and this is the very essence of our democracy.

But to the extremist, there is no other side. There is nothing to debate. There can be no compromise.

For the other side is not merely the opposition, but the enemy—the evil conspiracy, and hence illegal.

If you're not with the extremist all the way, you must be at worst a traitor, at best a fool.

And so it doesn't matter who our President is—Johnson, Kennedy, Eisenhower. To the extreme right, they are all Communists or pro-Communists, and to the extreme left they are all Fascists or pro-Fascists.

I find it hard to suppress a smile when a Birch member admits to me that Robert Welch may be wrong and just a trifle intemperate in labeling Eisenhower and Dulles and NATO and the CIA as Communist agents, but fervently declares that the society itself is just great.

To me, it's like a Communist saying he thinks Marx was a nut, but that the party is just fine.

The John Birch Society was founded squarely on the premise that Dwight D. Eisenhower was a Communist. Without that notion, Welch would never have formed his society.

I also find it hard to suppress a shudder when I hear a top Birch Society official, John Roussetot, assert that 2,000 of Los Angeles County's peace officers are Birch members.

Whether 2,000 or 200, that frankly disturbs me more than all the reports of Minutemen training in the hills with rifles and bazookas.

Another very real danger, I believe, lies in the fundamental and sometimes frenetic bigotry and hate inherent in extremism.

It's almost necessarily present in extremism, because it's very hard not to hate what you think is evil.

Moreover, it's hardly a secret that, for example, the old Silver Shirts, Gerald L. K. Smith, was vehemently attacking the Supreme Court, integration, the income tax, the United Nations, Eisenhower, et al., as communistic long, long before Robert Welch appeared on the public scene.

Indeed, the only significant difference between the beliefs of Robert Welch and the beliefs of Gerald L. K. Smith is that Welch blames everything in this world on the Communists and Smith blames it on the Communist Jews.

I do not mean to suggest that all extreme rightwingers are bigots. But almost all of the American group founded upon hate are rightwing.

In some organizations, such as the Citizens Councils and the National States Rights Party, the bigotry is overt. In others, it is covert or latent. But it is there, and it is foreboding.

And it is logical that it is there.

For, if you believe that our land is in the grip of such a monstrous conspiracy, it is only a small step further to find Jews, or Negroes, or Catholics, or what-have-you, behind it all.

The danger in all of this, I think, can be summed up by noting just a few words from a leaflet in widespread circulation not very long ago—and I quote:

"Like a giant spider, the Jewish international world stock exchange capital creeps over the people of this earth, gradually sucking their marrow and blood."

"Thousands and thousands of its paid agents are untiringly active in the press and in political parties."

"Three hundred men who know one another dominate the world."

"Where are the political parties and where is the so-called press?"

The time was July 20, 1921. The place was the Zirkus Krone in Germany. The angry speaker was a Herr Adolf Hitler.

I remind you that not many Germans paid much tribute or applause to that newcomer and his conspiracy theories in those early days.

Or attention.

The literature of extremism is highly combustible.

By its very nature, it incites and inflames.

The trouble is that one never knows in what dark corners of society tortured souls may be listening—and believing.

Here are a few more words from still another leaflet:

"Throw the Jews out of commerce, where they damage property and the people's wealth."

"We rescued them from the Germans who dealt more wisely with them."

"Our people is not as it used to be. It has been infected by the Jews."

Sounds like the Ku Klux Klan, doesn't it? But it isn't the Ku Klux Klan.

That particular leaflet was posted, by a group called the "Beat the Jew Committee," on buildings by the hundreds on October 4, 1959—in a Moscow suburb called Malakhovka.

A short time later, the suburb's synagogue was burned down, and the caretaker's wife strangled by unknown assailants.

The Soviet Union has had a long, murderous history of anti-Semitism, especially during the years of Stalin.

Today, under a more moderate but still totalitarian regime, it is as rampant as ever. This is not surprising.

The Communist Party is also basically anti-Catholic and anti-Protestant. Like any extremist group, it must be opposed to any influence which does not subordinate itself entirely to party doctrine.

The point, however, is not to single out the Soviet Union or Hitler's Germany.

Hate is hate, wherever practiced—in Russia, in Germany, in the United States, anywhere.

There can be no apology for it and no acceptance of it.

I firmly believe that Americans must be ceaselessly alerted to hate, wherever it appears, and shown again and again why it is so dangerously ominous—and so dangerously wrong.

Let me make one thing crystal clear: I do not believe the United States of America is in any imminent peril of capture by the extremists, right or left.

So, then, what do we do about it? Anything? Nothing?

First of all, I pray, the one thing we never do is to prohibit the ideas, the thoughts, the trumpetings of any extremist group.

For, if we do, we will no longer be a truly open and free society—and that openness and that freedom is the pillar of our democracy and our greatest strength.

To me, extremism is a virus, not a cancer. If we sought to remove it surgically, the body of America would be badly weakened by the operation and perhaps destroyed.

But I think we should do something—and a very great deal more than we are presently doing.

The extremist today is on the move.

Besides frightening a disturbingly large number of Americans, he tends to monopolize public discussion.

He beclouds concentration on the real issues, by focusing on the unreal.

He daunts the weak and the timorous, especially at the local level.

He incites his neighbors to supplant reason and understanding with emotion and hate.

He divides and degrades America.

As the Los Angeles Times once pointed out so aptly—subversion is subversion, whether from the left or from the right.

It is imperative that the virus of extremism today not be ignored—or allowed to go untreated—at this moment when it seems more virulent, infectious, and menacing than in any recent time.

The prescription, I believe, is massive and constant doses of strong serum of truth.

This is by no means any easy chore.

For the extremist can confound even the well-educated with the scraps of truth, half-truth and wholly imagined "evidence", which he uses to construct his woolly case.

It is a nerve-wracking task, to boot.

For the extremist, once scratched, fights back, employing any and all means.

The task is further complicated because we do not know exactly why the extremist believes and behaves the way he does—except that he dislikes and distrusts the American society in its present form. On the extreme right, he yearns for what he believes was a golden past. On the extreme left, he's captivated by a fool's gold of the future.

But the treatment is, I strongly believe, a necessary one.

The time has come, I think, for all Americans—liberals, moderates, and conservatives, the press and the churches, business and labor—to isolate, point out, and reject totally the extremism on both sides of us, the conspiracy theories, the ends-justify-the-means philosophy, the authoritarian contempt for our democracy, the hatred and the bigotry.

Most viruses become powerful enough to wreak severe damage only when the bodies they seek to infect become weak.

The virus of extremism will be only as strong as we permit it to become.

We know that extremism thrives on fear, hate, and bigotry.

But I suspect that we are not yet fully aware that the greatest ally of extremism is indifference.

Edmund Burke said it best, and I paraphrase the enduring wisdom of his remarks to Parliament in the 18th century: "Evil triumphs only when good men fail to act."

We cannot be indifferent to the strident voices and the sinister tactics of the extremists.

We cannot be indifferent to the dynamic sources of our own strength as responsible Americans.

Fear of extremism is not the answer to today's challenges from the right and the left. Faith in ourselves is.

Where Americans have a firm and active faith in themselves and their system of representative government, extremism will shrivel into inconsequence.

Where the voices of intelligent conservatives, moderates, and liberals speak out clearly and confidently on the issues of our time, the snarls of the extremist right and left will fade into whines.

The good people of this Nation and State—and they form the multitude—must act and speak out against the evils of extremism.

Each of us must express our faith in our society through words and work—in our news media, businesses, clubs; in our neighborhoods, communities, and cities; in all the channels of communications and influence within the structure of our society and our Government.

More of us need to speak out, with positive and active faith in ourselves and our Nation. Silence is not golden, my friends. Silence is darkness. In the darkness, the extremist contrives to tarnish this golden

State. And then bend it to his perverted will.

Truth, faith, and the clear voices of good men of many persuasions will spotlight the extremists of the right and left, and reveal them as they really are—feeble and fearful, holding only the weapon of fear and the weapon of hate.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MONRONEY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, a fine article by Bert Mills paying tribute to the work of the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] appeared in the July edition of National Publisher. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY ROOM TO CAPITOL HILL: MEET MIKE MONRONEY
(By Bert Mills)

A former newspaperman and proud of it, Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, is the new chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. This is perhaps the most important position in Congress in framing postal rate legislation and other laws relating to the postal service.

Senator MONRONEY talked about his ideas on postal and other matters in an interview at his office soon after his elevation to the postal committee chairmanship. NEA's Ted Serrill and this correspondent supplied the questions and the Oklahoma veteran answered readily. In keeping with his press background, nothing was off the record.

Upon arrival in the Senator's office, the NEA visitors were greeted by Carter Bradley, administrative assistant, a close friend of Ben Blackstock, manager of the Oklahoma Press Association. Bradley is a regular attendant at OPA conventions.

The last thing Chairman MONRONEY said to the NEA team was: "I have a soft spot in my heart for the little newspaper." As Ted Serrill reminded him, that was demonstrated back when Congress was in the process of passing the 1962 rate increase law.

That was the law that ended the historic free-in-county mail privilege on in-county mailings. In its place, the bill almost ready for passage called for imposition of a one-eighth cent per piece charge the first year and a one-quarter cent rate the second year.

At the request of NEA, Senator MONRONEY sponsored an amendment to delete the second year increase. This prevailed and is a part of the present law, saving weekly newspapers nearly \$1 million in postage annually. Senator MONRONEY also sponsored another amendment sought by the Oklahoma Press Association and this too became law.

HAS 26 YEARS IN CONGRESS

Now 63 but looking and acting younger, MONRONEY has been in Congress for more than 26 years. He served in the House for 12 years and has been a Senator for 14. He has been on the postal committee since 1951 and in the recent past has been chairman of its Postal Affairs Subcommittee.

The old Oklahoma News, a Scripps-Howard newspaper then published in Oklahoma City, was his stepping stone to a political career. He began as a boy wrapping singles in the mail room, and recalls driving a horse and wagon to the express office and riding a bicycle to collect for want ads.

While attending high school in his native Oklahoma City, he wrote a weekly column for the News. While at the University of Oklahoma, he edited the campus daily and corresponded for the News and other papers—and won a Phi Beta Kappa key besides

He became a full-time reporter for the News upon graduation and covered the Oklahoma State house. His big break, he recalled, was scoring an 18-hour beat on the retirement plans of U.S. Senator Robert L. Owen. That made him a political writer.

The untimely death of his father drove MONRONEY out of the newspaper field. He took over the family furniture business and operated it for 10 years. In 1937, he ran for office for the first time, seeking a seat in Congress. He lost, but has never been defeated since. One year later he was elected a U.S. Representative and has been in Congress ever since.

COAUTHORED REORGANIZATION ACT

Representative MONRONEY made his mark in a hurry in Washington. While only in his fourth term, he won the 1945 Collier's Award for Distinguished Congressional Service. He became a specialist in the organization of Congress and with Senator Robert M. La Follette, Republican, of Wisconsin, co-authored the Reorganization Act of 1946 which streamlined Congress.

Nearly two decades later, the organization of Congress is still a major interest of MONRONEY. He now serves as cochairman of the Joint Committee on Reorganization of Congress, which is attempting to update the 1946 law and achieve needed reforms. Hearings have been held and prospects are excellent for another enactment.

In 1950, MONRONEY challenged veteran Senator Elmer Thomas, Democrat, of Oklahoma, for his seat. He beat Thomas in the primary, easily defeated a Republican opponent in the November election, and has been a Senator ever since. His present term does not expire until 1968.

Aviation has been a major legislative interest of MONRONEY. He was the author of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which established the Federal Aviation Agency. Six other aviation laws are credited to him, and he has been awarded the Wright Brothers Trophy for service to aviation and the Tony Jannus Prize for his contributions to the scheduled airline industry.

His aviation activities have stemmed from his membership on the Senate Commerce Committee, and heading its Aviation Subcommittee. He is also the chairman of the Automotive Marketing Subcommittee and was the author of the Automobile Labeling Act of 1958, requiring window stickers to disclose the factory price of new cars.

Senator MONRONEY is also a member of the potent Appropriations Committee. He heads its Legislative Subcommittee and serves on five other subcommittees, including the one handling funds for the Post Office Department. Obviously he is a mighty busy legislator, often supposed to be at two or three meetings at the same time.

HAS INDEPENDENT VIEWS

Senator MONRONEY made it plain during his NEA interview that he will not simply rubberstamp postal legislation sent up to him from downtown. He has a questioning attitude. He does not pretend to know all the answers and he will reserve judgment on some issues until he hears the facts.

Take the ZIP code, for example. He called it "a good effort" but he does not know whether its full-scale use will actually speed mail delivery. He thinks it should be tested for delivery results "after it has been in the woodwork long enough." He has named a subcommittee to study ZIP code.

Soon after MONRONEY became chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, President Lyndon B. Johnson sent to Congress a Federal pay increase bill. This will be handled by MONRONEY's committee. He is for a salary raise but against one novel feature of the White House proposal—to allow semiautomatic increases in pay in future years without congressional action.

Publishers concerned about their postage rates will be glad to know that Chairman MONRONEY does not favor combining postal pay and postal rate increases in a single bill. "I think they should be separate," he told NEA.

Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy both linked pay rate increases on the theory that if postal workers got a raise, users of the mails should pay this added cost through higher rates. The last two rate increases have combined a pay and a rate bill. It is good news that Senator MONRONEY objects to this practice, as does NEA and every other mail user group.

DUBIOUS ABOUT PRIORITY MAIL

Postmaster General John A. Gronouski has announced plans to seek legislation to establish a "priority mail" service, combining first class and airmail. Presumably this would mean the end of 5-cent letters and 8-cent airmail, and the substitution of a priority mail rate of 6 or 7 cents. The Post Office would use trains or planes to transport mail, whichever would give better service.

Senator MONRONEY is interested in better service but he is not so sure that ending airmail is the answer. He is not against the Gronouski plan, he just wants the facts laid on the line before he makes a decision. This is a typical attitude for the new head of the postal committee. He is a bearcat for facts and does not jump to conclusions.

Mechanization of the postal service is another subject on which the Oklahoma legislator remains to be convinced. If economical and practical, he is for it but he believes it can be overdone. He cited a personal experience with mailing eight wedding presents, every one of which was broken in the mails. He blamed machine handling for the breakage.

On the other hand, Senator MONRONEY agrees with most mail user groups that the Post Office Department "has been niggardly in asking for research and development funds and Congress has been niggardly in giving research dollars" to the POD. In his position, on the Appropriations Committee, MONRONEY is in a strategic spot to influence Post Office thinking on mechanization.

SEES RATES AS CONTROVERSIAL

Senator MONRONEY is a veteran of the postal rate wars. He knows all the arguments on both sides. He has supported rate increases when he felt they were needed, but at the same time he has exerted his considerable influence for moderation in the amounts. It would be a good guess that this would be his attitude in the future.

He does not know whether the Johnson administration plans to propose a rate increase. He will cross that bridge when he comes to it. But there is one key preliminary he hopes to get out of the way before the next rate bill comes along. He wants an independent cost study made by a top accounting firm. He has discussed this matter with the Postmaster General.

When the 1962 rate increase was on its way through Congress, the Senate Post Office Committee wrote into its report that a full study of costs should be made before another rate increase was considered. MONRONEY regrets this research has not been done and hopes to arrange it in the future. "It should have been done last year," he told NEA.

Serrill raised with Senator MONRONEY the problem of the "dilution of second-class mail"—the granting of second-class entry to publications which do not deserve the privilege. While Senator MONRONEY was unaware that a wall map had been granted second-class entry, he did know of the situation in general and promised to help "clean up second-class mail."

He is concerned about the cut rates for charitable institutions and realizes what a

large burden such rates impose on Post Office Department finances. He does not know the answer and is aware of all the controversy which greets every effort to raise charity rates, but he hopes to find a solution.

A DISTINCTIVE TOUCH

Like every other Senator, Chairman MONRONEY has a press secretary. She is Mrs. Beth Short, widow of Joe Short, who was press secretary to President Harry S. Truman. Mrs. Short has a solid newspaper background herself, but her duties are a little different from most Senate press aids.

For one thing, Senator MONRONEY writes his own speeches and press releases. He doesn't just dictate them, he types them himself. Behind his desk there is a typewriter—an ancient L. C. Smith which he dug up and had restored at a cost probably greater than a new electric machine. He is delighted with it.

There may be other Senators who are touch typists but probably Senator MONRONEY is the only one who bats out copy on an old standard model. Mrs. Short sometimes feels like a copy girl as she processes speeches and releases "takes" hot off the boss' typewriter. She indicated that the Senator's private office is not unlike a newsroom as a deadline nears.

If the next postal rate law is written at least in part on that L. C. Smith, newspapermen can at least take comfort that it was done by a city room alumnus who remains at heart a newspaperman.

INCOME TAX LOOPHOLES

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post, Stewart Alsop points out some facts about the loopholes in our tax structure—facts which demonstrate how that structure favors the very rich, particularly those who have amassed their fortunes in certain businesses which enjoy a special tax status. There are many in the Senate, notably the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who have been pointing out the inequity of these loopholes for some time, but I think Mr. Alsop's brief essay is an especially pointed and concise statement of the problem. We must face up to the fact that we did not finish the job with last year's income tax cut and this year's excise tax cut. We still have some unfinished tasks of tax reform facing us. The long-range prospects for our economic system depend, among other things, on the existence of an equitable tax structure. Something is wrong when it turns out that the man who earns \$5,000 a year is paying a greater percentage of this income in Federal taxes than the man who earns \$5 million annually. And something is even more wrong when it turns out that the man who earns \$5,000 a year is actually paying more money in taxes than the man who earns \$5 million. These are documented facts. So that others may see Mr. Alsop's remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW BIG RICH—A POSTSCRIPT (By Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—A good many years ago George Kennan, then chief of the State Department's policy planning staff, suggested

that I look up a certain Russian refugee in New York. The man was intelligent, Kennan said; he had been a major Communist functionary in the Soviet Union, and he knew a lot about how the system really worked.

The next time I was in New York I telephoned the Russian, and he asked me to dinner, giving a rich-sounding Park Avenue address. A maid dressed in Mary Petty style ushered me into a handsomely furnished duplex apartment, and I sat down to a memorable meal, with two good wines, followed by a really impressive brandy.

Over the brandy and cigars, the Russian remarked that when he arrived in the United States a few years before, he had only the clothes on his back and one \$5 bill. "Then how in the world?" I asked—and finished the question by gesturing at the opulent surroundings.

"Very simple," said the refugee in his heavy accent. "In Communist Russia, way to get ahead is to be a Communist, so naturally I am a Communist. In capitalist America, way to get ahead is to be a capitalist, so naturally I am a capitalist."

So he was. Using a little borrowed money and a lot of foresight, he had acquired for a song an option on some mothballed World War II freighters and started a coal-shipping business. Then, under the Marshall plan, the United States began shipping coal to Europe on a vastly greater scale than ever before—and the Russian's business did so well that, when I saw him, he was worth several million dollars.

In recent months, while working on an article on "America's New Big Rich," which appeared in the last issue of the Post, I often recalled George Kennan's Russian friend. For what he said is quite true. If getting ahead and getting rich are the same thing, then "in capitalist America, the way to get ahead is to be a capitalist."

In a capitalist society there is surely nothing wicked about being a capitalist. Aside from being interesting and original human beings, the six men who were the subjects of my article—who have made an average of \$200 million in the last 20 years—created thousands of jobs in the process of enriching themselves. And yet the months I spent on the trail of the new rich raised certain questions in my mind about the tax structure which, in many ways, determines how the American capitalist system really works.

Under the present tax structure there are two ways a man can become a major capitalist. He can invent a useful new product, patent it, market it and enjoy a Government-protected monopoly for the life of his patents. One of the men I wrote about—Dr. Edwin Land, who invented the Polaroid camera—became very rich in this way. A great inventor like Dr. Land has an indisputable right, recognized for generations, to the protection of the patent laws.

The five other men I wrote about became rich in the second, and much more usual, way. They piled up huge fortunes in certain businesses—notably oil, insurance, savings-and-loan and real estate—all of which have one thing in common. They all provide useful tax shelters. These days, in order to build a really big fortune, a man must be what Howard Ahmanson's nephew once called Ahmanson, the immensely rich California savings and loan man—"a genius at tax law." Either that, or he must hire a genius for a tax lawyer. One of the chief secrets of becoming very rich is to avoid—quite legally, of course—paying heavy income taxes, or even, in some cases, any income tax at all.

I did not ask my six rich men what income tax they paid. A man's income tax is his own business—and the business of the Internal Revenue Service—and if I had asked them, they would have told me, quite rightly, to go to hell. But it was not really necessary to ask. Certain statistics compiled

by the Treasury Department tell the income tax story of the new big rich, as a class.

These statistics show that the man with an "adjusted gross income" (income after business and other deductions) of \$1 million a year pays, on the average, a smaller proportion of his income in taxes than the \$50,000-a-year man. The man with an adjusted gross income of \$5 million a year, in turn, typically pays a smaller proportion than the \$1-million-a-year man.

The Treasury statisticians based their study on the year 1959, when the top income tax rate (which literally nobody paid) was supposedly 91 percent. In the Kennedy-Johnson tax reduction passed by Congress last year, the top bracket was cut back to 70 percent. This was a useful step in the right direction. No man in his senses would risk his capital if he had to absorb all losses, while the Government picked up \$9 out of \$10 of profit. Thus, if taxes had really been paid at the rates established in the tax tables, the capitalist system would have collapsed.

But even a 70-percent top tax rate puts an enormous premium on finding tax loopholes. A capitalist has a right to expect a reasonable return in "keeping money" for risking his capital. According to experts, if the chief loopholes were closed, the top bracket could be cut to 50 percent without loss of revenue, and 50 percent is surely not confiscatory. Then a genuinely progressive tax system, based on ability to pay, could be restored. But the most important loophole closing reforms were knocked out of the Kennedy-Johnson program by Congress. Our progressive income tax system therefore remains what it has been for years—a myth.

Our loophole ridden tax system as it now operates gives the tax sheltered businesses a big advantage over less favored businesses. It thus has a distorting effect on the national economy. But what is much more important, the system is unfair in human terms.

The man who uses money to make money keeps far more of it than the unfortunate fellow who uses his brains or his talents to earn a salary in a company or a taxable income in one of the professions. But the unfairness does not end there. For example, a very rich man who has inherited his money can put it in tax-free bonds and pay no income tax at all, while a man with two dependents, earning a mere \$5,000 a year, has to pay almost a tenth of his income to the Government. This is not only unfair—it is grossly unfair.

Gross unfairness can be very dangerous in a democracy, particularly if the economy runs into real trouble. In that case, the unfairness could endanger the capitalist system itself—a system which, for all its faults, has worked better than any other.

THE DANGERS OF BOMBING HANOI

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Republican calls to bomb Hanoi do not serve the cause of a rational foreign policy for our country in Vietnam. In its July 19 issue Newsweek published a well-reasoned column by Walter Lippmann on this subject. As Mr. Lippmann convincingly warned:

It is most probable that if the President followed the Laird-Ford line, he would find that the North Vietnamese Army, which is a very good one, intervened not only by infiltration, as now, but in force. It is not improbable, moreover, that if we destroyed the missile sites and the oil tanks and storage depots of North Vietnam, the Soviet Union would step up its aid to make good the important losses. This would bring the President face to face with Moscow and produce a worldwide crisis.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HARD LESSON

(By Walter Lippmann)

A very substantial majority of the people, upward of 60 percent according to the Gallup and Harris polls, support the President on Vietnam. Yet, the White House and the State Department cannot, I feel sure, fail to be reading into these returns the provisional and conditional nature of the popular support. It rests almost entirely on the hope that the President's policy will succeed, on the belief that the President is in a better position to judge than is anyone else, on dislike of any alternatives thus far proposed, and the patriotic feeling that in time of trouble good citizens should rally around the President.

But while the President's supporters are a large majority, the quality of their support is fragile. To keep it the President must make good in Vietnam itself, and not merely in his arguments with Congressmen and journalists. There are important signs that, as the situation in Vietnam becomes worse, the Republican support of the President is breaking up. Senator DIRKSEN by himself is no longer able to deliver the Republicans. Congressmen LAIRD and FORD, following the Goldwater line, are preparing a trap for the President which it will not be easy for him to avoid. Nothing that has come from the liberal opponents has anything like the bite of the Laird-Ford opposition.

FORMULA FOR VICTORY

Messrs. LAIRD and FORD start from the position which President Johnson has arrived at—that a military victory is impossible, that all we can hope for is a stalemate to be followed by the negotiation of a compromise settlement. If that is the best the President wants, they say, it is not worth the commitment of a large mass of American soldiers and the inevitable casualties of a prolonged guerrilla war. This puts the Republican activists in opposition to a big land war in Asia, which is undoubtedly the real sentiment of the mass of our people. However, while the mass of our people do not want a big land war, they do want something that looks like a victory. Messrs. LAIRD and FORD offer them a formula for victory. It is to bomb North Vietnam from the air and keep the GI's out of the foxholes.

The Laird-Ford formula is superficially so plausible and so attractive that the President is going to have a hard time refusing to try it. As long as he does not bomb Hanoi and Haiphong, he will be unable to prove to the country that Messrs. LAIRD and FORD did not have the magic formula for achieving everything we want without paying much of a price for it.

There is, however, no magic formula. There is no reason whatever to think that the destruction of Hanoi and Haiphong would bring the war in South Vietnam to a satisfactory conclusion. For nearly 6 months our bombers have been moving north, and Hanoi has been put on notice that the bombers can do and may do just what Messrs. LAIRD and FORD now say they should do. There has not been a quiver from Hanoi to suggest that the North Vietnamese would pay even a small price to avoid the bombing. On the contrary, there is much evidence that their will to fight has grown harder.

It is most probable that if the President followed the Laird-Ford line, he would find that the North Vietnamese Army, which is a very good one, intervened not only by infiltration, as now, but in force. It is not improbable, moreover, that if we destroyed the missile sites and the oil tanks and storage depots of North Vietnam, the Soviet Union would step up its aid to make good the important losses. This would bring the

President face to face with Moscow and produce a worldwide crisis.

At some point, the President and his advisers are going to have to ask themselves why everything goes wrong—be it under Henry Cabot Lodge or Maxwell Taylor—why over the years all our hopes have been dashed and one plan after another has failed. It is not that we have not tried. It is not that the military and civilian leaders have not been efficient and faithful in their specialties. It is, I believe, that we have set ourselves a task, which, like squaring the circle or perpetual motion or living 200 years, is impossible to do. It is an impossible task for the United States to reach across the Pacific Ocean and to determine what shall be the constitutional foundations of a country in Asia, or by force of American arms to assure a weak country that it will be non-Communist, self-governing and independent of its enormously big neighbor.

To say that something ought to be done does not make it possible to do it. That is a hard lesson to learn. It is a hard conclusion for politicians to admit. But it is one of the lessons every nation, like every individual, has in the course of time to learn.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the fate of the captive nations is the most heart-rending legacy of the last war and one of the heaviest burdens that presses upon the conscience of free world leadership. The tragedy is that today the free world is in no better position to help these nations than at any time during the last 20 years. Their situation poses a great human dilemma, perhaps one of the greatest such dilemmas in modern history.

It is sad that while the free world won a triumphant victory over its deadly Nazi and Fascist foes, more than 100 million people in central and eastern Europe fell under the steamroller of Communist totalitarianism. Deliberately, treacherously, and in flagrant violation of its wartime pledges, the Government of the Soviet Union imposed its iron rule over peoples living in areas from the Baltic to the Black Sea. For two decades these peoples, including 17 million Germans in East Germany, have been separated from the free West.

All the efforts made by the governments of the free world have not brought about any change in the lot of captive nations. But we in this country are firmly determined to do all we can to have these nations freed. We have also resolved to keep the issue before the public by annually observing Captive Nations Week, in pursuance of a joint congressional resolution passed in 1959 and annual Presidential proclamations. I am indeed happy to raise my voice in support of the observance of Captive Nations Week.

CALIFORNIA COTTON

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Commodity Credit Corporation will shortly own 10 million bales of cotton. I am proud to note that very little of this surplus will be California cotton which is efficiently grown and has remained competitive in both the domestic and world markets. Last year only about 1½ percent of California's cotton was taken over by the Government.

Mr. President, I have long been concerned with the declining use of cotton by our textile industry. If cotton is not to be completely replaced by synthetics, there is a need for an encouragement of the production of quality cotton. There is also the need to relieve the already overburdened taxpayer from having to pay for supports on cotton that is not of sufficiently high quality to be used in our high-speed and efficient modern textile mills. That is why I made known my support for the Agricultural Act of 1964 as it pertained to cotton when it was before the Senate in March 1964. There were some provisions in that legislation which I questioned, but I keenly believed that our cotton industry needed an opportunity to revitalize itself so that it could once again become competitive.

The Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives has now reported an omnibus farm bill, H.R. 9811, which contains some useful provisions to encourage the production of quality cotton. I hope my colleagues on the Senate Committee on Agriculture will continue to give this question the deep study which they have been giving it so that at long last quality cotton production may be encouraged in America.

Mr. President, I ask consent that a telegram which I have just received from Mr. John P. Benson, president of the Western Cotton Growers Association, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 19, 1965.

SENATOR THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

California cotton has not caused the pileup in carryover and Government-held stocks which has created the crisis in the cotton industry.

It is estimated that on August 1 of this year, the Government's Commodity Credit Corporation will own 10 million bales of cotton. This is one of the largest supplies of cotton ever held or owned by any government or corporation. And practically none of it will be California cotton.

Last year only about 1½ percent of California's cotton was taken over by the Government. The figures for most other States was 50 to 85 percent. This simply means that the American textile mills did not buy all that cotton and the Government had to.

As we pointed out at the Senate hearings, quality is one of the keys both to increased cotton consumption and to the mounting pile of Government-owned cotton. On the one hand, if more quality cotton were produced more cotton as a whole and less synthetics would be used. On the other hand, the production of cotton which the textile mills pass over contributes both to the increase of Government-owned stocks and the increase in the use of synthetics.

I urge you to vigorously present these facts when cotton legislation comes before the Senate for consideration.

Regards,

JOHN P. BENSON,
President, Western Cotton Growers Association.

PROFESSORS SUPPORT VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, a statement strongly supporting the administration's policy in Vietnam has just been issued

by 67 professors from various American colleges and universities. Although this document was circulated at the end of the academic year when many instructors had left their campuses, it is signed by a number of distinguished political scientists, historians, economists, and other faculty members.

At this critical period it is reassuring to have this positive assessment by experts in international affairs about the course we are now pursuing. These professors assert that in their opinion—

U.S. policy in Vietnam is consistent with the realities of the situation, the goals of American foreign policy, and the peace and freedom of South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this statement, together with the list of signers, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM BY POLITICAL SCIENTISTS AND OTHERS

To dispel the notion that any small but active and vocal groups of teachers and students speaks for the entire academic community on the problem of Vietnam, we the undersigned feel it necessary to make clear our support for the policies of President Johnson. We do not believe the U.S. policy in Vietnam has been free from errors, but its infallibility is not at issue. At issue are its relevance, realism, and morality. We believe U.S. policy in Vietnam is consistent with the realities of the situation, the goals of American foreign policy, and the peace and freedom of South Vietnam.

We strongly desire peace in Vietnam and a political settlement of the war achieved through negotiation among responsible parties. We regret the involvement of American troops in a foreign war. We believe the President shares these commitments and regrets. We believe in the good faith of his reiterated desire to seek a political settlement of this war through negotiation, any time, anywhere, with any responsible parties.

We ardently support social, political and economic reform in Vietnam and elsewhere, and welcome all efforts to achieve representative institutions, economic opportunity, personal freedom and a higher standard of living for all. We believe that the present Democratic administration has made clear its dedication to progress in Vietnam by its very substantial development program and its promise of massive assistance when the cessation of hostilities makes possible full concentration of the Vietnamese people on the job of development.

We believe that war is a gruesome travesty on civilized decisionmaking and that the war in Vietnam is a hideous burden on the people of that nation. However, we also know—for this is a matter of evidence, not of opinion—that the war in South Vietnam resulted not from a spontaneous outburst of popular unrest, not from American invasion, but from the deliberate exportation by Hanoi of waves of troops trained in the tactics of terrorism and guerrilla warfare. Aggression from the North is not merely a cliché in a propaganda war; it is combat-ready soldiers, trained and equipped by Hanoi, armed with modern weapons, and Mao's strategy for the subjugation of a peasant population. We regard it as exceedingly significant that no major population group in South Vietnam supports, or has supported, the Vietcong.

Confronted with the sharp escalation of Hanoi's aggression against South Vietnam, the U.S. Government had available a limited number of alternatives:

The United States might have sued for peace and met Hanoi's reiterated demand for withdrawal of all American support to South Vietnam. It would thereby have permitted South Vietnam to be integrated into the totalitarian Leviathan to the north, and have abandoned tens of thousands of South Vietnamese who have resisted totalitarian expansion to liquidation as enemies of a new Communist ruling class.

The United States might have done nothing, and permitted its own forces and those of South Vietnam to be defeated by Hanoi's enlarged forces. This course would have added humiliation to withdrawal, would have enhanced the "paper tiger" image of the United States, as well as have consigned South Vietnam to totalitarianism.

The United States might have launched an all-out war against North Vietnam and destroyed that nation's cities and industrial capacity utterly and precipitously.

The United States might have begun a restrained increase of its military effort, designed to escalate the price of aggression and enhance the incentives for peaceful settlement.

Among the unsatisfactory and limiting choices available, we believe the President chose wisely. We support his continued efforts to find a political settlement that will achieve peace and freedom for South Vietnam.

Finally, we reject the bizarre political doctrine that President Johnson or his principal advisors have special obligations to the academic community. Obviously, the administration has obligations to explain its policies to the American people. But to suggest that some group of university professors has a right to a special accounting is as outrageous as to suggest that the corporation executives of America, the plumbers, the small businessmen, or the barbers have special claims on the Government and its principal spokesmen. It is a fundamental principle of democracy that all categories of citizens are equal under law, and that neither wealth, nor class, nor expertise entitles a citizen to preferred treatment by his Government.

Ulrich S. Allers, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Dean Stephen Bailey, Maxwell School of Citizenship, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y.; Comer Clay, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Joseph Cooper, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; George Demetriou, director, Institute for the Comparative Study of Political Systems, Washington, D.C.; Martin Diamond, department of political science, Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif.; Eleanor Lansing Dulles, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Valerie A. Earle, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; John T. Everett, Jr., Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Mark F. Ferber, assistant professor, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers—the State University, New Brunswick, N.J.; Victor C. Ferkiss, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Richard M. Fontana, department of political science, Douglass College, New Brunswick, N.J.; Robert W. Foster, professor of law, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; Carl Friedrich, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Wayne E. Fuller, professor of history, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; Stephen P. Gilbert, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Walter I. Giles, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Joseph B. Graus, department of government, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; Richard Greer, executive director, Operations & Policy Research, Inc., 4000 Albemarle Street, NW., Washington, D.C.; Ernest S. Grif-

fith, dean of the School of International Service, American University, Washington, D.C.

George D. Haimbush, Jr., associate professor of law, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; Morton H. Halperin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; John F. Haltom, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Donald G. Herzberg, professor of political science, director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers, the State University, New Brunswick, N.J.; Samuel Huntington, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Jan Karski, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, Trinity College, Washington, D.C.; James E. Larson, professor of political science, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; J. R. Leguey-Felleux, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Karl H. Lery, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

Michael F. M. Lindsay, professor, far eastern studies, American University, Washington, D.C.; Benjamin E. Lipincott, professor of political science, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.; Seymour Martin Lipset, professor, political science, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; George A. Lipsky, professor, political science and geography, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.; Kurt L. London, professor, international affairs director, Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.; Charles Burton Marshall, Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research, Washington, D.C.; Neil A. McDonald, professor, political science, Douglass College, New Brunswick, N.J.; John H. McDonough, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Franz Michael, professor, international affairs, associate director, Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Warren Miller, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.; S. D. Myres, professor, department of government, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; William V. O'Brien, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; George R. Osborne, department of political science, Douglass College, New Brunswick, N.J.; Robert E. Osgood, School of Advanced International Studies of the Johns Hopkins University, Washington, D.C.; Roland I. Perusse, associate professor of government, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; Charles W. Procter, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Lucian W. Pye, professor, political science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.; George H. Quester, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Charles H. Randall, Jr., professor of law, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.

Emmette Redford, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.; Warren A. Roberts, professor, political science and economics, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.; A. A. Rommer, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Harold W. Rood, department of political science, Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif.; Paul Seabury, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; Joseph S. Sebes, S.J., Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Warren Shearer, professor of economics, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.; August O. Spain, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Melvin P. Straus, associate professor of government, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.

Susan Tallman, political analyst, Operations & Policy Research, Inc., Washington, D.C.; Donald Tacheron, associate director, American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.; N. H. Timmons, professor of history, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; Procter Thomson, professor, economics and administration, Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif.; Richard L. Walker, director, Institute of International Studies, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; Donald B. Weatherbee, assistant professor, Institute of International Studies, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; Clyde Winfield, chairman, professor of history, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; Gerard F. Yates, S.J., Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; I. William Zartman, associate professor, Institute of International Studies, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.

OUR COMMITMENT IN VIETNAM— THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, our stake in Vietnam grows daily. Involved is our Nation's pledge to an ally and the freedom of the free world as well. The times could hardly be more serious.

Against this background, Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to two editorials, one from the Wilmington, Del., Evening Journal and the other from the Christian Science Monitor.

The Evening Journal editorial emphasizes that three Presidents have committed this country to help South Vietnam and "for this Nation to fail to keep such a commitment is not only to insure the condemnation of others, it is to invite a whole series of costly consequences that could end in disaster."

The Christian Science Monitor editorial outlines what it calls "three moral and practical obligations" of the administration; namely, "to explain more convincingly to the American people and the world why Washington believes this war must be fought and won"; "to tell the American people as fully and as frankly as is possible what this war will demand of them"; and "to win that war with the utmost speed consistent with decency and common humanity."

Because they are so timely, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials entitled "Our Word Is at Stake" and "All the Facts on Vietnam" be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Evening Journal, July 15, 1965]

OUR WORD IS AT STAKE

For those who have failed to realize the gravity of the situation in Vietnam, President Johnson's statements at his press conference on Tuesday should be enlightening. We have in mind not only the military position, which has been deteriorating; we are thinking of the nature of this Nation's commitment.

The war has been going against the South Vietnamese forces at an accelerating pace since the start of the monsoon season. Vietcong concentrations of a size not seen until this year have overrun important towns; Government units in battalion strength have been ambushed and virtually wiped out; even

in the neighborhood of Saigon troop movements are hazardous. More and more American strength has been thrown into the struggle in order to bolster South Vietnamese resistance.

Meanwhile the bombing of bridges and military installations in North Vietnam by American aircraft, more often without South Vietnamese support than with it, has been intensified. Our planes have been ranging north of Hanoi and not far from the Chinese border. But the damage has not prevented the Vietcong from stepping up their offensive.

Now President Johnson says that new dangers and difficulties in Vietnam and increased aggression from North Vietnam may require a greater American response on the ground. So it is "quite possible that new and serious decisions will be necessary in the near future." If many more troops are to be sent, steps will be required to "insure that our reserves of men and equipment remain entirely adequate for any and all emergencies."

That is, there may be a callup of Reserves. Congress may be asked to appropriate additional sums. Draft calls may be increased. To put it bluntly, this amounts to a partial mobilization—for the purpose of supporting an ally fighting a land war it cannot win alone.

This is a grim prospect. The decisions that may be necessary are unwelcome at best. More and more voices have been asking in recent weeks why the United States is in Vietnam. Some have been calling for withdrawal. For them the President had some sober words to explain why we will do what is necessary.

Three Presidents have undertaken to meet the request of the Government of South Vietnam for help against its enemies, in keeping with our pledge under the SEATO treaty. That is the legal and moral basis of our presence there, and to keep that commitment is now a matter of national honor. Our word is at stake.

Let no one underestimate the import of that statement. Let no one sneer at the President invoking the concept of national honor in justifying a further escalation of this undeclared war. For this Nation to fail to keep such a commitment is not only to insure the condemnation of others; it is to invite a whole series of costly consequences that could end in disaster.

There is only one way for the United States to avoid the hard decisions the President foresees. That is to give the Communists the victory—since they have made it clear that they will settle for nothing less. But would such a surrender purchase peace? We do not believe it. It would only encourage the aggressors to strike again and again. To deter them we must keep our word.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 16, 1965]

ALL THE FACTS ON VIETNAM

Now that the U.S. Government has made it clear that it is determined to achieve in Vietnam those military ends which it believes are right and necessary, Washington faces three moral and practical obligations. The first of these is to explain more convincingly to the American people and the world why Washington believes this war must be fought and won. The second is to tell the American people as fully and as frankly as is possible what this war will demand of them. The third is to win that war with the utmost speed consistent with decency and common humanity.

Although we understand and sympathize with the difficulties, both domestic and foreign, which President Johnson faces over Vietnam, we do not believe that any one of these three obligations are yet being met. Washington's explanations on American involvement in Vietnam have left far too many

Americans—to say nothing of the rest of the world—confused, doubtful, and in many cases even indignant. Washington has deliberately refrained from telling the American people what the White House and the Pentagon really know; the cost of victory will be high, the road to victory hard and probably long. Finally, the present American buildup of troops, bases, and material in Vietnam may not be adequate for even a long-drawn-out effort at victory, to say nothing of a swift and decisive effort to end the conflict.

At any time, anywhere, and under any circumstance war is a heart-rending human tragedy. But once a war is begun, the wisest and most merciful procedure is to win that war as quickly as is consistent with every humane consideration left the warrior.

Nor will anything be gained by failing to be utterly frank with the American people. If Vietnam is to require larger armed forces, a callup of reserve units, new military appropriations, the sooner and more fully the American people are told of this the better. At present, this news is coming out in dribs and drabs, in hints, in leaked stories and in other roundabout ways. It is little wonder that the American people seem uncertain and confused about what is going on.

We believe that the American aims of preserving South Vietnam's independence, of halting outside aggression, and of seeking a negotiated peace with honor and justice are right. But we also believe that these may well require greater sacrifices than Washington has yet admitted. It is high time that the White House made this plain.

A CAMPUS-EYE VIEW OF BUSINESSMEN

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, a year ago this month the University of Utah signed James C. Fletcher, a vice president of Aerojet-General Corp., and chairman of his own Space General Co., to be president of the university. During his first short year, President Fletcher has compiled an excellent record. All of us are proud of him.

I noticed in Nation's Business for July that he also has proffered some sound constructive suggestions for removing existing barriers between educators and businessmen and fostering a greater mutual understanding.

President Fletcher cites the apparent prejudice on the part of many educators toward the profit motive. At the same time he reminds those on campuses that there would be no large public universities without a prosperous business community.

To quote from the article:

More contact with industry would provide university people with the opportunity of seeing firsthand what the businessman is up against, Dr. Fletcher believes. "If the exposure did nothing more than offset the bias against profitmaking, it would be worth the effort," he adds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CAMPUS-EYE VIEW OF BUSINESSMEN—IT'S OFTEN UNFLATTERING BUT IT CAN BE IMPROVED, SAYS UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT JAMES C. FLETCHER

Businessman James C. Fletcher has learned a great deal since he became president of a major American university 1 year ago this month.

Some of the lessons have been reassuring, others disquieting.

He feels that on far too many college campuses, far too many professors are voicing inaccurate, unflattering, and outdated ideas about businessmen and the profit system, and the misconceptions are being passed along to young people like a low-grade infection.

His observation is neither gratuitous nor casual, but the deliberate expression of one who is as much at home in the world of businessmen as he is in the world of academicians.

Before launching a highly successful electronics enterprise in the 1950's Dr. Fletcher was an instructor in cosmic ray physics at Princeton and Cal Tech. By the time he stepped into the presidency of the University of Utah at Salt Lake City last year he had become a vice president of Aerojet-General Corp. and chairman of his own company, Space General.

He concedes that he, too, had a strong prejudice against the profit motive when he left university life to enter business for the first time.

"I went into business to try it for a year," Dr. Fletcher recalls. "I stayed 15 years. In the process I gained a healthy respect for business, the role of profits in our society, and a new respect for the contribution businessmen make to America. Unfortunately, a lot of people in our colleges and universities have negative views on all of these points—unless, of course, you are talking about those departments of a university specifically geared to business."

On campus, he points out, it is often forgotten that the Nation's prosperity depends on business. "We wouldn't have large public universities if we weren't prosperous," he states, citing his own tax-supported 13,000-student institution as an example.

More often than not, the professorial attitude toward the businessman is equivalent to the portrait of the entrepreneur drawn by George Bernard Shaw in his plays, Dr. Fletcher has found.

"The businessman, as seen by Shaw, is typically hard-nosed, gruff, a 'blast the unions' and 'fire this guy if he's not up to capacity' type. That's the image university people quite often have. To many of them business is undignified and not a really useful pursuit."

To remove the wall of misunderstanding which often separates the educator and the businessman, Dr. Fletcher recommends much greater interchange of ideas. He has in mind two-way traffic because he feels that businessmen themselves are sometimes guilty of looking at higher education through the wrong end of the telescope.

One move that would help, he suggests, is for businessmen to invite more university professors to serve on corporate boards of directors. Doing this, the businessman would hear questions raised and points of view expressed that otherwise are missing in a typical business setting. Some of this thinking could be useful as well as refreshing, the 46-year-old educator asserts.

ADVISORY BOARDS URGED

Another step he recommends is the creation of more industrial advisory boards to universities. Among other things, these boards—comprised of businessmen—would help schools of higher learning bring their curriculums realistically into line with the needs of industry. "This is already being done to some extent," he says, "but there is room for more of the same."

Dr. Fletcher says the curriculum planners have to be especially careful in these days of rapidly changing technology. At his own school the faculty was about to give a course in a certain technical field until a check with industry showed that the field was already obsolete.

More contact with industry would provide university people with the opportunity of seeing firsthand what the businessman is up against, Dr. Fletcher believes. "If the exposure did nothing more than offset the bias against profitmaking it would be worth the effort," he adds.

VICE PRESIDENT SPEAKS ON HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the pros and cons of the establishment of a Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development have received considerable public debate. A recent guest editorial in the Saturday Review magazine provided an informative statement by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY on the subject.

I found the Vice President's remarks deserving of close attention by the Members of Congress, for, as he pointed out, he has been working, at President Johnson's request, with the Nation's mayors, county officials, and city managers in an effort to determine effective programs to meet the urgent demands facing our cities.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD this article, "Making Cities Fit for People," as contained in the July 3, 1965, issue of Saturday Review.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING CITIES FIT FOR PEOPLE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following guest editorial, by the Vice President of the United States, discusses the proposed Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development.)

Robert Herrick said in the 17th century that great cities seldom rest: If there be none to invade from afar, they will find worse foes at home. We know those foes today. They are slums, crime, a lack of playgrounds and parks, overburdened schools, inadequate transportation, crowding, lack of clear air, and inequality of opportunity.

It was only 45 years ago that people in American cities first began to outnumber people on our farms. By 1960 only 11 States had more rural than urban population.

But most of these States will not remain that way very long. The urban population of North Dakota, our most rural State in 1960, jumped 35 percent in the 1950's. Alaska's urban population increased 150 percent, and three other States—Arizona, Florida, and Nevada—more than doubled their urban population during this period.

By 1970 we can expect that three-fourths of our people will be living in towns, cities, and suburbs, compared to 70 percent in 1960. Most of our people will be concentrated in metropolitan areas. At the end of 1964, two-thirds of our population lived in 219 such areas, an increase from 59 percent in 1950. By 1980 that proportion will increase to three-fourths, and by the year 2000 to four-fifths.

There have been several patterns of metropolitan growth. One has been mass migration from farm to city. One has been mass migration of Negroes out of the South—virtually all of it to central cities. Another has been mass migration of middle- and upper-income people from the core city to the suburb. And great growth has come from a higher birthrate and from longer life expectancy.

This growth has imposed new and unprecedented burdens on local government for schools, housing, streets and highways, commercial expansion, transit, and welfare programs.

In the past 10 years, State and local debt has more than doubled, while Federal debt has risen only 15 percent.

State and local government employment jumped from 4,600,000 in 1953, to more than 7 million employees in 1963. During the same decade, State and local public expenditures more than doubled, increasing by 132 percent to \$65 billion in 1963. Major among these were expenditures on transportation, education, highways, sanitation, and parks and recreation, with increases from 140 percent to 165 percent during the 10 years. Interstate on State and local public debt jumped by 258 percent.

Along with these sharp rises in costs of public services and facilities, the growth of these urban areas has also created explosive racial and economic pressures.

I remember during my two terms as mayor of Minneapolis, at the close of World War II, the strains placed on our city by changing population patterns. Those strains were small compared to those today. Example: In the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area, nearly three-fourths of the people lived in 1950 within the city limits. Today those cities' populations remain constant, while population in their suburbs has more than doubled. The same pattern is common to nearly all our major metropolitan areas.

The picture is clear: There has been a shift of middle and higher income groups into the suburbs, out of the taxing jurisdictions of the inner city, while too many of the poor and disadvantaged have remained behind or moved in from the poorer rural areas.

Although the suburbs have provided cheaper land and lower cost housing for many middle-income families, as well as for the more prosperous, they have been populated largely by those able to afford better housing. Those at or near the poverty level have remained concentrated in the slums and poorer sections of the central city. Faced with deterioration and decay, the inner city has found itself with greater tasks to undertake and with fewer ready sources of money. At the same time, the suburbanites have had their hands full creating public facilities and services in communities that were open grass fields a few years ago.

Behind the statistics and population patterns have been thousands of personal and community tragedies, many of them created by those of good intention. There are the impersonal housing projects that in many cases have displaced families and destroyed the traditional fabric of neighborhood life. There are the freeways that have torn through people's homes and businesses, cut through parkland, and done no more than add to the noise in our streets and poison in our air. There are the shortsighted zoning decisions that have blighted neighborhoods and reduced property values.

Because of these discouraging experiences, it would be easy to say that many of our metropolitan problems stem from apathetic or inept local government. In a few places this is true. But in most it is not.

I have been working, at President Johnson's request, with the Nation's mayors, county officials, and city managers. Almost without exception I have found these men and women to be dedicated, competent, and deeply concerned with the problems pressing on their constituencies. Most of them have long since initiated constructive programs of their own in an attempt to keep pace with the urgencies facing their cities. But they have been fighting massive problems with dwindling resources. And they have not had any single place to turn for counsel and assistance.

One of their major difficulties, they tell me, is that no one Federal department or agency has had either authority or responsibility

to work with mayors and county officials in areas where they need most help. Our mayors and county officials have not, in many instances, been able to get advice or a rapid answer in Washington—much less Federal funds.

In 1963 the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations identified over 40 separate programs of aid for urban development, administered by some 13 Federal departments and agencies. Small wonder that the committee reported that "the effect of inconsistencies is felt most keenly in urban areas where programs of all kinds at all levels of government most frequently come together."

It cited particularly inconsistency and conflict between politics, or lack of them, in relocating people displaced by public activities. While a community plans for the relocation of people displaced from a renewal area, not infrequently still another public project, undertaken with Federal help, displaces additional numbers with no rehousing plan—and may even eliminate some of the housing urgently needed to meet the problem.

Jet airports may be announced in residential growth areas, driving down values of homes financed with Federal mortgage insurance or guarantees. A right-of-way for a federally aided highway may be purchased, cutting through an area that another agency is seeking to acquire and preserve as public parkland.

One test of democratic governments is its ability to respond rapidly to changing conditions.

In 1953 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was created to provide top-level Federal policy and direction in meeting the human and social needs of our citizens. HEW treats, to a large degree, the symptoms of urban disease.

But until recently there has been no similar recognition of the need for a top-level Federal department to help meet the physical and environmental problems of metropolises—in many cases the causes of urban disease.

Today most of the key programs having to do with urban development, improvement, and housing are lodged at a secondary level of Government, in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This independent Agency was created in 1947, under President Truman, to administer the housing programs of the FHA and the Public Housing Administration as continuing peacetime activities. Since that time all manner of programs have been added to HHFA's responsibilities, including urban renewal, urban planning, mortgage supports, public works, college housing, mass transportation, open space, and housing for the elderly. Its broad major responsibilities now cover at least 10 distinct and definable areas of activity. If you add the many special programs administered under the Agency, the number would more than double. Its programs today involve some type of Federal support for more than \$70 billion in private and public investment in housing and urban development.

About 77 percent of this—more than \$54 billion—is private-housing mortgage investment insured by the FHA. Public housing accounts for about 10 percent—\$7 billion—in capital investment by local public bodies, secured by annual contributions pledged by the Federal Government. Federal grants reserved or committed for renewal of our urban areas total about \$4.5 billion, and loans for college housing nearly \$3 billion. Lesser amounts include loan or grant commitments for such programs as housing for the elderly, public works planning and construction, open space acquisition, urban planning assistance, mass transportation, and mortgage financing support for GI home loans.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency was never intended to fill its present job. It

is a loosely knit instrument. According to law, three of its officials are appointed by the President and report directly to him. In a legislative sense, at least, there is no one official in command.

When the President meets with his Cabinet he cannot find out what or how the Federal Government is doing overall in assisting towns, cities, and metropolitan areas. The agency most concerned with these areas is not even represented at the Cabinet table.

In the past several years much has been done through executive cooperation and coordination to mesh various urban-related problems throughout government. Glaring conflicts have been avoided. But this has been done the hard way, through bits and pieces of agreements and consultations among officials and staffs at many levels, in many agencies.

Ad hoc committees and interstaff memorandums are no substitute for executive direction.

In 1961 President Kennedy became the first President to propose creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs. Committees of both the Senate and the House of Representatives reported the bill favorably, but it did not reach the floor in time for action at that session of Congress. When the proposal was resubmitted in 1962 as a reorganization plan, it failed to receive House approval. Much of the opposition expressed, as the record shows, was based on misconception of what the plan would do or considerations unrelated to the merit of the proposal.

Today the reasons advanced for opposing a new Department are: That it would be too costly; that it would mean Federal domination over local communities and States; that it would benefit only the large cities; that the Government is already too big, and this Department would make it bigger.

I disagree with these contentions.

The Department bill would authorize no increase in expenditures; instead, it would simply mean that the Government's money would be better spent. It would add no authority to the Federal Government it does not now exercise. It is important to the larger cities but, if anything, even more so to the smaller communities, less able to cope with their growth problems—indeed, the great proportion of communities using these programs are small towns, down to the village level. And the argument against "big government" gives no consideration to the fact that the country and its urban needs and problems are far bigger than we were able to foresee even a decade ago.

The needs of our urban areas have not diminished; they have become more pressing. President Johnson's proposal for a Department of Housing and Urban Development must be considered in this knowledge.

The President seeks from Congress the authority to bring good management to Federal responsibilities in our metropolitan areas. He asks for coordinated direction of these activities by a single Government department. And he asks for a place at the Cabinet table for the head of that Department.

The bill itself says in part that the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall undertake "maximum coordination of the various Federal activities which have a major effect upon urban, suburban, or metropolitan development," and "the solution of problems of housing and urban development through State, county, town, village, or other local and private action, including promotion of interstate, regional, and metropolitan cooperation."

Are our metropolitan areas important enough to merit top-level consideration in the Federal Government?

The answer is certainly "Yes."

We have long since given Cabinet status to our national concern for our natural resources, our agriculture, our trade and commerce, our labor force, and the social health and educational needs of our citizens.

Surely our cities and metropolitan areas—where three-quarters of us live—are worthy of the same attention.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

PRAYER BY REPRESENTATIVE HARLEY O. STAGGERS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I was present on Sunday, June 2, at the opening session of the third annual National Youth Science Camp at Camp Pocahontas, W. Va., when Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS, of West Virginia, made an eloquent prayer for the spiritual guidance of the fledgling young scientists in attendance. This honors camp for the top science-minded students in the Nation, 2 from each of the 50 States, who are entering college this fall, is designed to provide a combined opportunity for work and recreation.

The camp is located in Pocahontas County in West Virginia's Second Congressional District which Congressman STAGGERS has ably and effectively represented for years.

His prayer for God's guidance in the tasks before the intelligent young Americans in the assembly is an eloquent one, and I ask unanimous permission to place it in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the prayer was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Great art Thou, O Lord, and greatly to be praised. Thou hast made a wonderful world and filled it with marvelous materials, both animate and inanimate. Thou has established order and system in the workings of Thy creation, so that all may rely on harmony in the relations of one form of being to another. Then, as the crowning act of creation, Thou hast made man in Thine own image, and breathed into him something more than the simple breath of life. For Thou has endowed him with the faculty we call intelligence, which we understand to be a grasp of the meaning of existence. We believe the gift of intelligence fits us to assume a part in the whole creative task, along with God, so that it is our part in life to help develop a more righteous world which conforms evermore and more fully to Thy purpose and will. In the beginning, Thy instruction to us as men was to take possession of the world, and to govern it. May we go about our assigned task, O God, in full acceptance of our unique relationship to the Creator of all nature.

We thank Thee, O Lord, for this assemblage of young and dedicated intelligence, selected from their fellows all over this great land by superiority of capability and achievement. A profound responsibility rests upon them. They may advance the work of Thy creative benevolence until the day of the new heaven and the new earth is nigh upon us; or they can turn back the clock of civilization almost to primitive chaos. In this congress of minds called by the hopes and the aspirations of the Nation and of this State, they pause to consider the part they may play in life. They have dedicated their energies and their perceptive capacities to the search of truth, which is to say, in search of what Thou wouldst finally will the world to be. May they never forget that the rest of the world, outside man himself, is indifferent to truth.

Things have no concern for progress or for retrogression. It is not their responsibility. Only man can direct change upward or downward. So, as they meet here, partly for pleasure and partly for pursuit of their business, may they keep always in the front of that intelligence with which Thou has blessed them the controlling fact that they are God's agents on earth sent to accomplish His will.

So may they enter upon their deliberations here and their activities through all future days with clean hands and pure hearts. And wilt Thou bless them, O Lord, in all their goings and comings, from this day forth, and forever.

TRIBUTE TO ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the inspiration of Adlai Stevenson permeated all levels of American politics, government, and society. I was thrilled and stimulated to follow his leadership in two presidential campaigns. I spoke for him in 1952 and 1956, and have always been proud that he was the leader of the Democratic Party in those years.

Adlai Stevenson voiced the aspirations, sentiments, and the beliefs of the Democratic Party and many of these have subsequently been enacted into law.

Though he did not win these presidential elections, many of his hopes and dreams became law of the land in his own lifetime. This is more than most men live to see.

The struggles of this man were the struggles of our Nation; and the fulfillment of his goals was the fulfillment of the goals of this country.

Just as many of his hopes for America have already become a reality, we will continue to see the image of this eloquent American reflected in the progress of the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that several articles in tribute to Adlai Stevenson from the New York Times of July 15, by Mary McGrory in the Washington Star and the Dallas Times-Herald, the Houston Chronicle, two stirring tributes to Adlai Stevenson in the Washington Post of July 18, 1965, one by Richard N. Goodwyn under the title, "He Never Learned To Hide His Soul," and one by Judge Carl McGowan under the title, "His Heritage Was Public Service, So He Ran," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 15, 1965]

STEVENSON'S ELOQUENCE

(NOTE.—Following are excerpts from the speeches, statements, and writings of Adlai E. Stevenson.)

From a speech of farewell to Illinois at the State Fair in Springfield, embarking on his first presidential campaign, August 14, 1952: "I am about to leave you on a long journey, and the route, by the way, won't be a military or political secret. I intend to cover as much ground as time and strength and resources permit."

From a speech in Denver in 1952: "I don't feel like a gift from Providence, and I really don't believe I am. I feel very much like a corn-fed Illinois lawyer who had gotten into the big time unintentionally."

At the funeral of this friend Floyd Lewis, Libertyville, Ill., in 1954: "Friendship is the greatest enrichment that I have found."

From a speech in Fairfield, Ill., in June 1954: "I believe that in 99 cases out of a 100, the American people will make the right decision, if and when they are in possession of the essential facts about any given issue."

From a speech in Chicago in 1952: "A campaign addressed not to men's minds and to their best instincts, but to their passions, emotions, and prejudices, is unworthy at best. Now, with the fate of the Nation at stake, it is unbearable."

From the same speech: "Long ago we asserted a great principle on this continent: that men are, and of right ought to be, free. Now we are called upon to defend that right against the mightiest forces of evil ever assembled under the sun."

From a speech in Flint, Mich., in 1952: "When I was a boy I never had much sympathy for a holiday speaker. He was just a kind of interruption between the hot dogs, a fly in the lemonade."

From a speech to the American Legion in Chicago in 1950: "I sometimes marvel at the extraordinary docility with which Americans submit to speeches."

From a speech in Rubana, Ill., in 1951: "Communism is the corruption of a dream of justice."

From a speech in Hamtramck, Mich., in 1952: "I tell you now that I will never fear to negotiate in good faith with the Soviet Union, for to close the door to the conference is to open a door to war. Man's tragedy has all too often been that he has grown weary in the search for an honorable alternative to war, and, in desperate impatience, has turned to violence."

From a speech while he was Governor of Illinois, delivered in Springfield in 1949: "Ours is a sad, disillusioned world. Too many people on this blood-soaked, battered globe live in constant fear and dread; fear of hunger and want, dread of oppression and slavery. Poverty, starvation, disease, and repression stalk the world and over us all hangs the menace of war like a gloomy shroud. But everywhere people cling to their hope and their faith in freedom, justice, and peace, though fear, anguish, and even death are their daily lot."

From his acceptance speech at the Democratic National Convention in 1952: "We must fight traitors with laws. We already have the laws. We must fight falsehood and evil ideas with truth and better ideas. We have them in plenty. We must not confuse the two. Laws infringing our rights and intimidating unoffending persons without enlarging our security will neither catch subversives nor win converts to our better ideas."

From the same speech: "Let's talk sense to the American people. Let's tell them the truth, that there are no gains without pains, that we are now on the eve of great decisions, not easy decisions, like resistance when you're attacked, but a long, patient, costly struggle which alone can assure triumph over the great enemies of men—war, poverty, and tyranny—and the assaults upon human dignity which are the most grievous consequences of each."

From a campaign speech in Peru, Ill., in 1948: "I don't believe irresponsible promises are good politics. Promise peddling and doubletalk may be expedient and catch some votes from the unwary and innocent, but promises also have a way of coming home to roost."

From a campaign speech in Bakersfield, Calif., in 1952: "If the Republicans stop telling lies about us, we will stop telling the truth about them."

From a campaign speech at Fort Dodge, Iowa, in 1952: "The Republicans have a 'me too' candidate running on a 'yes but' platform, advised by a 'has-been' staff."

From an article in the New York Times magazine in 1949: "The First World War was a shock, but not a lesson."

From a speech in London in 1945: "The will to peace cannot be legislated. It must be developed, and can only be developed by organized, patient effort. The laws and institutions of international cooperation have to evolve out of a combination of the aspirations and experience of the peoples of the world."

From a message to the Illinois Senate explaining his refusal to approve a bill to restrain the movements of cats, on April 23, 1949: "I cannot agree that it should be the declared public policy of Illinois that a cat visiting a neighbor's yard or crossing the highway is a public nuisance. It is in the nature of cats to do a certain amount of unescorted roaming * * * to escort a cat abroad on a leash is against the nature of the owner. Moreover, cats perform useful service, particularly in the rural areas. The problem of the cat versus the bird is as old as time. If we attempt to resolve it by legislation, who knows but what we may be called upon to take sides as well in the age-old problems of dog versus cat, bird versus bird, or even bird versus worm. In my opinion, the State of Illinois and its local governing bodies already have enough to do without trying to control feline delinquency."

At a banquet in 1962, shortly after the Soviet Union removed its missiles from Cuba, when he introduced President Kennedy: "Author, producer, and star of Mr. Khrushchev's new play, 'A Funny Thing Happened to Me on the Way to Cuba.'"

Confronted with the charge that he was an egghead, during the 1952 presidential campaign: "Eggheads unite! You have nothing to lose but your yolks."

From a radio address during the Congo crisis, which was being debated at the United Nations, on March 2, 1961: "And to the Soviet Union I would say: There are laws of history more profound, more inescapable than the laws dreamed up by Marx and Lenin—laws which belong not to class relationships or stages of economic development, but to the nature and the destiny of man himself. Among these laws is the certainty that war follows when new empires thrust into collapsing ruins of the old. So stay your ambitions * * * do not sabotage the only institution which offers an alternative to imperialism."

From a speech at a college reunion on June 8, 1962: "You know the story about the man in the restaurant who complained to the waiter that his broiled lobster had only one claw, and the waiter said it lost the other one in a fight; so the man said, 'All right, then bring me the winner.' Well, the United States is still the winner in the United Nations."

From an address at the United Nations on June 19, 1962: "If communism is a problem for the United Nations, so is the United Nations a problem for communism. The United Nations is a community of tolerance and a community of tolerance is a terrible frustration to the totalitarian mind."

From a statement in a Security Council debate on Aug. 5, 1964: "We are in southeast Asia to help our friends preserve their own opportunity to be free of imported terror, or alien assassination managed by the North Vietnam Communists based in Hanoi and backed by the Chinese Communists from Peiping."

From a commencement address to the Harvard Alumni Association, Cambridge, Mass., on June 17, 1965: "The art of government has grown from its seeds in the tiny city-states of Greece to become the political mode of half the world. So let us dream of a world in which all states, great and small, work together for the peaceful flowering of the republic of man."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, July 15, 1965]

MEMORABLE QUOTES: MASTER SHAPER OF PHRASES

NEW YORK.—Adlai E. Stevenson was a philosopher among politicians—a master of shaping a careful phrase and quick ad lib.

An articulate speaker, he could spellbind an audience in haughty tones with a scholarly treatise and almost instantaneously crack a joke about being called an egghead.

He is remembered best by many for his quotes. Here are some of them:

An eulogy to Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt—"Like so many others I have lost more than a beloved friend. I have lost an inspiration. She would rather light candles than curse the darkness, and her glow has warmed the world."

On party principle—"Who leads us is less important than what leads us—what convictions, what courage, what faith—win or lose. A man doesn't save a century, or a civilization, but a militant party wedded to a principle can."

After months of crisis debate at the United Nations in 1961—"What with Cuba, Congo, Korea, and now Laos, I sometimes yearn for the simple brutalities of bipartisan politics."

During a visit to the Soviet Union in July 1958—"I sometimes think it might be a good idea to declare an international 'Stop—Look—and Listen' day, a day on which politicians, officials, and diplomats everywhere in the world would pause and look and listen with eyes and ears and minds open to the desire of the ordinary people everywhere for peace."

On communism—"Communism resolves no anxieties. It multiplies them. It organizes terror. It is without spiritual content or comfort. It provides no basic security."

On the United Nations (1961)—"There is really only one item on our agenda—the survival of the human race."

Speech to Harvard Alumni Association, June 1965—"I have been picketed, applauded, and abused from right and left and center everywhere from Texas to Toronto for more years than I like to remember. Indeed my honorary degree should have a P.D.—a doctor of pickets."

In July 1959, explaining to British audience why he wanted to avoid running for president—"A presidential candidate has to shave twice a day—and I don't like that."

On politicians—"Politicians are often the most conventional, hidebound fellows in business. Eventually you discover you can do what you think is best and generally it works out all right. You get a bottomless pit if you try to figure out the political consequences of every step."

On speaking—"The relation of the toastmaster to speaker should be the same as that of the fan to the fan dancer. It should call attention to the subject without making any particular effort to cover it."

On public responsibility—"I should like to point out that public officials don't corrupt each other: That behind every bribe taker in government is a bribe giver, behind every fix is a fixer, behind every influence peddler is someone who wants influence, behind every lobbyist is a pressure group. Who are they? Why, they are 'the people.' And sometimes they are not cheaters and scum, but the same 'respectable' people who demand that all officials in a government by the governed should be cleaner than the governed, cleaner than themselves."

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, July 15, 1965]

ADLAI FULL OF QUIPS, MOST OF THEM AIMED AT HIMSELF

ADLAI E. Stevenson was a man of enormous wit.

At public appearances, in interviews, with friends, in speeches—it was a rare occasion

when Stevenson failed to delight his listeners with his sense of humor. Usually, it was at his own expense.

As Governor of Illinois, he once vetoed a bill prohibiting cats from running at large. He commented:

"It is in the nature of cats to do a certain amount of unescorted roaming. In my opinion, the State of Illinois and its local governing bodies already have enough to do without trying to control feline delinquency."

During the 1952 campaign, Stevenson was frequently called an "egghead." When confronted with the charge, he quipped: "Eggheads unite—You have nothing to lose but your yolks."

Stevenson never lost a chance to joke about his defeats.

Once, when a friend was appointed to a post, Stevenson told him: "Congratulations on your election as president." He added, wryly, "I know from hearsay how satisfying that can be."

After the Soviet Union was forced to remove its missiles from Cuba in 1962, he introduced President Kennedy at a banquet as "author, producer and star of Mr. Khrushchev's new play, 'A Funny Thing Happened to Me on the Way to Cuba.'"

He used the same approach before a Washington audience shortly after he was trounced at the polls by Eisenhower. Said Stevenson: "A funny thing happened to me on the way to the White House."

When President Kennedy kept tapping his Chicago law firm for energetic, young lawyers (such as former Federal Communications Commission Chairman Newton Minow), Stevenson said: "I regret that I have but one law firm to give to my country."

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, July 15, 1965]

"AMERICA'S MOST ELOQUENT SPIRIT"—JOHNSTON—MEN IN HIGH PLACES VOICE REGARD FOR ADLAI STEVENSON, STATESMAN

WASHINGTON.—"The flame which illuminated the dreams and expectations of an entire world is now extinguished. Adlai Stevenson of Illinois is dead."

Thus a shocked President Johnson expressed the grief of the Nation.

"It seems such a short time ago that, out of Illinois, came that thoughtful eloquence summoning an entire Nation back from its dangerous drift toward contentment and complacency," he said.

"For an entire generation of Americans, he imparted a nobility to public life and a grandeur to American purpose which has already reshaped the life of the Nation and which will endure for many generations."

"Let us therefore, adversary and friend alike, pause for a moment and weep for one who was a friend and guide to all mankind."

Here in this Capital City, the embodiment of Adlai Stevenson's hopes and dreams in two great presidential campaigns, the news of his death in London sent a wave of shock reverberating through the corridors of power.

NEARLY HALTED LUNCH

The President was informed of the death as he was presiding over a luncheon for the Joint United States-Japan Cabinet Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs.

His face solemn, Mr. Johnson informed his guests: "A few minutes after this lunch began, I received word that Adlai Stevenson had died in London. My immediate reaction was to suggest that we cancel this meeting. But then I knew Adlai Stevenson would not want it that way."

"He would want us to continue because he was first concerned that the works of peace, the works of progress, and the works of understanding go on."

He added, "America has lost its most eloquent spirit, its finest voice. The world of freedom and human dignity has lost its most articulate champion."

Shortly afterward, the President went on nationwide television and radio to pay his formal tribute to the Ambassador. He announced that Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY would lead a delegation to London, flying on the President's personal plane, to accompany the body home.

FLAGS AT HALF STAFF

He ordered the flag flown at half staff on all Government facilities at home and abroad, and aboard U.S. Navy ships at sea, until the funeral.

Johnson compared Stevenson to another son of Illinois, Abraham Lincoln.

"Like Lincoln, he was a great emancipator," the President said. "It was his gift to help emancipate men from narrowness of mind and the shackles of which selfishness and ignorance place upon the human adventure."

"Like Lincoln, he will be remembered more for what he stood for than the offices he held; more for the ideals he embodied than the positions in which he served. For history honors men more for what they were than who they were."

"And by this standard he holds a permanent place on that tiny roster of those who will be remembered as long as mankind is strong enough to honor greatness."

Both the House and Senate were in session when the news flashed across the wires. In the Senate, it was announced by PAUL DOUGLAS, the craggy Illinois Democrat whose own rise to senatorial fame came in the 1948 Illinois election that made Adlai Stevenson Governor of the State.

DIRKSEN LAUDS

The other Senator from Illinois, EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, had his own eulogy: "I count this an irreplaceable loss. I thought and I still think Adlai Stevenson was one of our great contemporary men."

House Democratic Leader CARL ALBERT interrupted debate on a bill to inform the membership: "I have just been informed by the Secretary of State that a great American, Adlai Stevenson, has just passed away in London while on a great and important mission."

There was a brief and quiet pause, and then debate resumed on the silver coinage bill.

At the Organization of American States, the Latin American ambassadors stood in silent homage to Stevenson for 1 minute and then adjourned for the day.

On Capitol Hill, one after another, Senators and Representatives rose to pay tribute—Republicans and Democrats alike. Those who had admired him, and those who had fought him, spoke of his eloquence and his ideals.

One to do so was Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama, Stevenson's vice-presidential running mate in the 1952 election that pitted the little-known Governor of Illinois—and 20 years of Democratic rule in the White House—against war hero, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

SPARKMAN SPEAKS

"He has not solved all the problems of the world at the United Nations, and he would be the first to say so," said SPARKMAN, "but the equilibrium of the world has been maintained and a great part of that is due to the leadership Adlai Stevenson has shown at the United Nations."

One of the first to comment was Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, who, as his brother's campaign manager, had battled the Stevenson forces at the 1960 Democratic Convention which resulted in John F. Kennedy's nomination.

KENNEDY was momentarily stunned when told the news. "It is a great, great loss to the world," he said.

KENNEDY told the Senate: "The United States, and all the world, can ill afford his loss at this new time of danger."

In New York, a member of her staff relayed Mrs. John F. Kennedy's reaction: "She is terribly, terribly shocked. She will make no public statement because she feels this is a very personal matter."

Mrs. Kennedy and the witty, urbane Stevenson had been close friends, and he had been her escort to several United Nations and other public functions in New York.

WIDOW SHOCKED

Ellen Border Stevenson, who divorced her husband in 1949, issued a statement through her business agent: "I am very much shocked by Mr. Stevenson's death but have no statement to make as I consider this a personal matter."

Out in Kansas City, Harry S. Truman, who had both praised and sometimes deprecated Adlai Stevenson's ability as a practical politician, expressed shock and grief at the news of the death.

"His contribution and services to this Nation and his distinguished record in the field of foreign relations in our quest for peace will be long remembered by a grateful Nation and his friends throughout the world," Truman said.

There was much that was said today about Adlai Stevenson, and these were some of the comments:

Secretary of State Dean Rusk: "America has lost one of her greatest sons. He not only served his country but he stood for the best of it. He not only spoke for his country but he represented the essence of it. Our history, our traditions, our ideals, our aspirations were in his mind, his heart, and his very bones. He never forgot that our Founding Fathers created for all mankind."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 15, 1965]

SYMBOL OF HONOR: STEVENSON, A "PERFECT GENTLE KNIGHT"

(By Mary McGrory)

Adlai Stevenson was a gentleman from Illinois who entered politics late in life, suffered two crushing national defeats and retired gracefully from the scene. He was an incomparable orator and, as a candidate, so diffident, so civil and so mannerly, so insistent on his own values that he might go down as a noble footnote in the history of his times.

But he was more than that. Despite the brevity of that career, it was crucial. He left his mark on American politics. His two successors used the bold ideas he had given them. They put to work the superior breed of men he had attracted to public service.

And all over America, in every political subdivision, there are men and women who lick stamps and ring doorbells and attend grubby meetings because 13 years ago the sound of Stevenson's voice, enunciating precisely a high-minded, high-hearted vision of public life, galvanized them permanently.

There has not been in memory a politician like him. He was unique because he insisted on the ultimate luxury most politicians immediately forgo—that of being completely himself in public.

Stevenson was a contradictory man: troubled yet merry; committed yet detached; idealistic yet rueful. He had a puritan sense of duty without a puritan self-righteousness and a reformer's zeal without the reformer's scourge.

His campaigns were the despair of the professionals and the delight of his followers. No candidate before nomination protested more articulately his own inadequacies. And no candidate spoke with more felicity and fire and wit.

Who would have thought the gently nurtured aristocrat would tread so heavily on the toes of the pressure groups—the American Legion, the labor movement, the Old South?

While his soldier-citizen rival held out the promise of painless peace, Stevenson cam-

paigned on the premise that life is hard and the world is in ferment.

The speeches of the 1952 campaign did not win the White House for Stevenson. But they did win him a place in literature.

He paid a high price. When he might have been gladhanding, he was reworking his phrases. No audience was too small to merit his best.

The memory of him on the platform is of a middle-aged man with a hole in his shoe, up to the moment of introduction frowningly busy with pencil on the script of the address. The English language had no more valiant or perfectionist friend. Stevenson retained to the end his belief in the power of words.

Political power eluded him, at least on the national scene. As Governor of Illinois, he seemed to understand all about it. But he had been brought up in a rigid creed of gentility, and he never could command the fighting excesses which the politician must use. In 1956, when the late Senator Estes Kefauver challenged him for the nomination and defeated him in the Minnesota primary, Stevenson went on the warpath in California, but for him it was a joyless and unpalatable enterprise.

In 1960, he was of two minds. While he characteristically deprecated his own chances, he knew the unalterable loyalty of his partisans. And despite his public manifestations to the contrary, Stevenson always knew his own worth. He would not give his followers the word.

The high point of the Los Angeles convention was the nominating speech of Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY of Minnesota, who, for Stevenson, reached the oratorical heights of the master.

"Do not," he cried, "reject this man who has made us all proud to be called Democrats," and the galleries went mad. "Do not leave this prophet without honor in his own party."

Stevenson, deprived of the great prize a third time, hoped that John F. Kennedy would make him Secretary of State. But Kennedy wanted to be his own Secretary of State and wanted no Cabinet officer with so fierce a personal following. Instead, he asked Stevenson to be Ambassador to the United Nations.

Stevenson had no enthusiasm for the job, but impelled both by the desire to serve and the reluctance to leave public life, which both repelled and attracted him, accepted.

It was a thankless chore, and Stevenson seemed always on the point of giving it up. He used to tell his friends he could not go on—and did. He would say the problems were impossible—and he coped with them.

He was sustained by the near reverence tendered him by the representatives of other countries who found in him a symbol of his own country's honor and integrity and good will.

His hold on the imagination of many Americans never weakened. At the 20th anniversary celebration of the United Nations in San Francisco, there were some who came, not to see President Johnson, but to see Adlai Stevenson, who was to them, as Senator MCCARTHY said, quoting Chaucer, "a very perfect gentle knight."

[From the New York Times, July 15, 1965]

WORLD LEADERS PAY TRIBUTE TO STEVENSON AS STATESMAN AND CHAMPION OF LIBERTY—U.N. ENVOY CALLED VOICE OF REASON—MANY PRAISE HIS DEVOTION TO PEACE AND COURAGE IN CAUSE OF FREEDOM

U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations, sent the following message to President Johnson: "I was so shocked and grieved to hear of the sudden and tragic death of Ambassador Stevenson. As the representative of the United States of America he had earned the respect, admiration, and affection

of all his colleagues at the United Nations for his extraordinary human qualities. I know that you must feel a sense of personal loss on the death of such a distinguished American who was also a member of your official Cabinet. Your grief is shared by all of us at the United Nations."

Harry S. Truman: "I am shocked and saddened at the untimely passing of Adlai Stevenson. His contribution and services to this Nation and his distinguished record in the field of foreign relations in our quest for peace will be long remembered by a grateful Nation and his friends throughout the world."

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower: "The announcement that a public servant of Adlai Stevenson's international stature should be suddenly and finally removed from the world strikes a tragic note for all Americans. As the leader of his party in two presidential campaigns and as our spokesman at the United Nations in recent years, he has won an abiding place in his country's history. Mrs. Eisenhower and I join all others who love freedom in mourning his untimely passing."

Chief Justice Earl Warren: "I'm just shocked. It's a tremendous loss. He performed the most difficult tasks in the United Nations any American had to perform."

Richard M. Nixon: "In the graceful eloquence of his public statements, he had no peers. In two gallant campaigns for the Presidency and as our Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson served his party, his country and the cause of freedom with rare courage, ability, and dignity."

Governor Rockefeller: "His was a life of distinguished public service. He was an articulate spokesman for the cause of human freedom throughout the world."

Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF: "Mr. Stevenson was a man of quality and he chose to use his gifts of brilliance, of compassion, of persuasion in the service of his nation and the individual human spirit."

Senator MIKE MONROE: "During these times of tensions, fears and uncertainties, the calm, strong voice of Adlai Stevenson will be sorely missed."

Mayor Wagner: "Adlai Stevenson was a spokesman for humanity. His wisdom, warmth, and courage are a legend that will endure and grow with the years to come. He was one of New York's beloved sons who, despite the great burden of his office, gave unstintingly of his time to scores of good causes. All of us in New York City join his millions of friends throughout the world in mourning his death."

Cardinal Spellman: "All the world must mourn the loss of a man so dedicated to the cause of peace as Adlai Stevenson. His death comes at a critical time when his remarkable talents and his tireless efforts for the betterment of mankind are sorely needed. I pray that God will reward his selfless service to others and that his soul may find eternal peace."

Michael Stewart, British Foreign Secretary: "In the sudden death in London today of Mr. Adlai Stevenson the world has lost a great statesman. As an outstanding public figure in his own country, as a candidate for the U.S. Presidency and as Governor of Illinois he showed a liberality of mind and lucidity of expression which brought him universal renown."

Sir Alec Douglas-Home, former British Prime Minister: "Adlai Stevenson will be mourned by his many friends and admirers in this country."

Lester B. Pearson, Canadian Prime Minister: "It is hard to exaggerate the importance of Adlai Stevenson to the free world or to his country. I can only express deep grief and deep shock at the news."

Jens Otto Krag, Danish Premier: "It was typical of Mr. Stevenson that he was always ready to listen to what was being said by

smaller countries. He was attentive not least to the views of the Nordic countries. The aim of his endeavor was a stable and just peace."

Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, former Indian Ambassador to the United States: "He stood for honor and justice among men and nations and his voice was the voice of reason in the United Nations."

The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.: "Our country should bow in reverence for the passing of a bright star from the horizon of world statesmanship. His leadership was a bright interlude in the troubled history of mankind."

Richard J. Hughes, Governor of New Jersey: "I know that the people of New Jersey share my grief on the loss of this conscientious and distinguished leader whose departure will be mourned by freedom-loving people throughout the world."

George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State: "He was one of my closest friends for 30 years. I am very stunned by this. No one ever had a more generous friend. He was a man of very great qualities."

Arthur J. Levitt, State controller: "The world has lost one of its most effective and eloquent spokesmen for peace and one of its great humanitarians."

Abraham D. Beame, city controller: "He was a man of great personal spirit, a man who contributed tremendously to liberal thinking in 20th century America."

Paul R. Screvane, city council president: "We, our city, our country, the world, have suffered a tremendous loss."

Representative WILLIAM F. RYAN: "In him was crystallized the best of a civilization."

Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY: "Adlai Stevenson was the eloquent voice of reasoned liberalism and human rights here in America, and indeed, the voice of America's conscience to the entire world."

Robert Moses: "His was the American image we are proud to show as the symbol of democracy."

Dr. Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University: "His was truly the global point of view, grounded in a profound love of his country and enlightened by compassion for all men."

Bishop Reuben H. Muller, president, National Council of Churches: "As citizens concerned for the promise of man, we mourn the loss of a great champion of man."

Right Rev. John E. Hines, presiding bishop of the Episcopal Church: "His image is that of the cultured, educated mind for whom fear held no decisive victory. He remained the kind of a man only the free world could produce."

Bishop Prince A. Taylor Jr., president of the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church: "He embodied in his life rare idealism and practical realities as only few men could have ever done."

Archbishop Iakovos, Greek Orthodox primate in the United States: "His passing is an irreparable loss."

Rabbi Maurice N. Elensdrath, president, Union of American Hebrew Congregations: "The world has lost one of its most valuable servants."

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times Herald, July 18, 1965]

NAME IN HISTORY, ADLAI STEVENSON EULOGIST ASSERTS

SPRINGFIELD, ILL.—Adlai E. Stevenson, that gentleman of wit and wisdom who gained worldwide renown, was officially honored Saturday by his old home State as an eloquent son—one who had done his task "honorably and well."

Governor Otto Kerner said as he faced Stevenson's coffin resting on a table on which Abraham Lincoln's body was once placed: "His name is written indelibly into our his-

tory. His memory and his spirit we shall carry in our hearts."

It was a short, dignified and touching service for the politician-statesman who died of a heart attack in London Wednesday at the age of 65.

Members of his family and 500 State officials and dignitaries gathered in the rotunda of the State capitol where Stevenson once served as Governor.

They heard Kerner use Stevenson's own words to express his affection for this land of fertile soil and rolling prairies.

"My heart will always be here in Illinois," Kerner quoted Stevenson as saying. "Here five generations of my family have lived and prospered. My roots are deep in our prairies and I owe Illinois a great debt. I have tried my best to discharge that debt honorably and well."

"Honorably and well," Kerner said. "How perfectly these words expressed the life and deeds of the 33d Governor of Illinois, the gentleman of wisdom and wit."

Again Kerner turned to Stevenson's own eloquence, saying that what Stevenson said of Lincoln could be said just as well of him.

"Lincoln was more than a writer, a spokesman," Stevenson once said. "What endears him in the minds of all freedom-loving people as the greatest Democrat in our history—or any history—was his own faith in democracy, in the ability of the people to govern themselves * * *"

Continuing his brief eulogy, Kerner said: "We lived in the shadow of greatness, a greatness which somehow seemed to bring to each of us a special feeling, a particularly kind of pride, a sense of satisfaction, that we lived in the world of Adlai Stevenson."

"This is a world that is better because of the life he lived, the deeds he performed, the words he spoke and the examples he set."

"Now he has come home to his Illinois, to take his place with our other heroes."

The Reverend Richard Paul Graebel, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church here which Stevenson attended, in his prayer said of Stevenson: "His spirit is at home in Thy presence."

Stevenson's body has been lying in state day and night in the rotunda, and those who have come to pay their respects have been filing by at the rate of about 1,000 an hour.

Sunday the body will be taken to Bloomington, 61 miles northeast, which Stevenson despite all his wanderings continued to look upon as his hometown.

Final services will be held Monday when Adlai Stevenson will be committed to the soil he always loved.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 18, 1965]

HE NEVER LEARNED TO HIDE HIS SOUL

"We shall not come again
We never shall come back again
But over us all, over us all,
Over us all is—something."

—THOMAS WOLFE.

(By Richard N. Goodwin)

Twice he had come as close as a man could come to leadership of the American Nation. Yet no one noticed as, for a moment, Adlai Stevenson looked toward the caped statue of Franklin Roosevelt, walked a few hundred yards, grasped the thin steel columns of a sidewalk railing, and died.

Questions of man's survival, of war, and of human progress had very nearly rested on the qualities of his personal mind and will. The destiny of every man and woman he passed that afternoon was almost placed in his hand. Yet no one cheered or waved or even turned to stare.

For he had escaped power. And for a politician, power is the tool which etches out one man's figure from among his companions.

IMPRESSIVE QUALITIES

Would he have been a good leader of his country, or a great one? We will never know. Many deny it. And they give reasons which start to persuade, until we remember that they—or their counterparts in other years—had said the same of past leaders such as John Kennedy and Franklin Roosevelt, and, most violently, of Abraham Lincoln.

The fact is no man who has not been President can survive analysis of his capacity for the task. Nor can we predict his qualities until they pass through the purification of power and responsibility. We do know he had more promise than most. We do know the impressive qualities of mind and spirit his career permitted him to reveal. We also know he was ambitious. For you do not run for President unless your ambitions are greater than those of other men.

Was that ambition tinged with self doubt? It is for every man except the very dangerous. Did he have the courage of decision? His own words, public and in private conversation, cloud judgment. But perhaps they only mask the fact that never in his public life did he fail to decide when it was time to decide; except in 1960 when the shameful prospect of leading his party to a third defeat postponed judgment beyond the reach of action.

Where public issues were concerned he spoke—on the platform and in the meeting room—with a clarity of conviction few had courage to match. And on this question the judgment of those who knew him is disfigured by the tortured musings of a man who had never quite learned the trick of hiding his soul; whose confidence had been twisted and battered by defeat and by the indifference and contempt of lesser men, which finally killed him.

He was not, as some have said, marked by fate for failure. He was the victim of less mystical forces: bad luck, poor timing, unfortunate issues, a party too long in office, and an opponent who could not be defeated. Had 6 percent of American voters switched to him in 1952 then all the hesitation and humility would today be regarded as the skillful genius of a master politician.

So we do not know, and will never know, if Adlai Stevenson would have been a good President of the United States. But we must be reluctant to believe that the judgment of so many who had desired his victory so furiously could have been so wrong.

Great men of affairs are either kings or prophets. Very few are both. And honor comes more reluctantly to prophets because they touch us more deeply. Adlai Stevenson never became a king, but he was a prophet. Death is already beginning to dissolve the masks of public failure and private personality which hide that recognition. It will become clearer as the self-justifying commentaries of those who scorned him in life begin to fade.

SEED ON UNPLOWED GROUND

I knew Adlai Stevenson as a colleague in my work for President Kennedy and, more recently for President Johnson. Both valued him most highly. Both had worked for his election to the office which they, not he, were to hold. Both knew, as others did not, what it took to bare yourself—ambitions and hopes—to the faithful, the indifferent and the hostile alike.

Many others in Washington, in these years, looked at him with a certain condescension. At times, thankfully only a few times, my own instinct was submerged in the need to be fashionable. But Adlai Stevenson will be mourned more deeply and remembered longer than any of these. It is not that millions loved him and millions more admired him. It is that closeness and ambition, envy and rivalry obscure the heart's truth. Yet that is the truth that finally matters; which selects the man from among the shadows,

sadly past the hour when recognition might bring personal joy.

But though I knew him and admired him, opposed him in 1960 and occasionally worked with him thereafter, many can speak far more intimately than I.

I remember best the Adlai Stevenson I never knew, when the world was young and the ringing phrases tumbled like the sowers seed on the unplowed ground.

In the fall of 1952 I was a senior in college in Massachusetts. John Kennedy was a young Congressman I had never met now running for the Senate. And Lyndon Johnson was the uncertainly familiar name of a Senator from Texas.

But Adlai Stevenson was my hero and my leader and my candidate for President of the United States. I never met him or even saw him nor had I read the carefully drafted texts of his speeches. But something was in the air. My tiny world suddenly seemed to widen. Events and the course of history were drifting back within the reach of a man's skill and brains. The pursuit of power, and its use, were not solely the object of greed and "vaulting ambition" but infused with service and nobility and the love of others.

It wasn't that he talked sense or spoke the truth harshly. It was the more profound act of telling us—my generation—what we knew but didn't realize. He revealed a world we already sensed was there, bared challenges we were aching to undertake. The words were the words of sacrifice but the music sang of meaning and purpose to a young man.

As much as any, he was the end of post-war America and the beginning of a time still nameless. We knew and still repeated the old political phrases and the outworn battle cries. But we did not understand them because the lines had been drawn in a different war, and it was not our war. Now finally, there was a language we could understand and make our own.

THE ELEVATED INTELLIGENCE

Eight dreary, near-tragic, years were to pass before that prophesy was to be fulfilled by different men. It is hard to overstate the extent to which he helped shape the dialog, and hence the purposes, of the New Frontier and then the Great Society. He dissolved the old, unserviceable simplicities and taught us to apply to the world the complex wisdom we have used so triumphantly in the affairs of our Nation: We could seek peace while resisting danger. Everyone who was not a friend was not an enemy. Agreement and accommodation could come from self-confidence as well as fear. By helping others we could strengthen ourselves. Particular problems could be resolved, but we must learn to live for generations with a troubled world. The contest was not simply between our system and communism, but between those who found security in dominion and those who found it in a world of strong and diverse lands.

And all these principles, and many more, he suffused with another welcome and shining truth: the pursuit of national self-interest was not inconsistent with the desire for justice and dignity and well-being for all the people of the world—that there was no basic unresolvable contradiction between realistic policies and high ideals.

To our domestic problems he brought the same elevated and critical intelligence. He told us our sights were too low, the course we had charted too narrow. In every area of our national life we not only could do more than we were doing but more than we thought. And he taught that wealth was not excellence, power was not greatness, the pursuit of abundance was not the pursuit of happiness.

After he spoke, no leader of his party nor the dialogue of democracy itself, would ever sound the same again. He was eloquent and

acclaimed for eloquence, but finally it was not how he spoke but what he said that mattered. Others would bring new accents and perhaps even greater powers to leadership. But it had all begun in Springfield, Illinois, in that hopeful dawn-year of 1952.

CITIZEN-POLITICIAN CREATED

The most far-sighted policies molded and dissolve, lose content and direction, in the hands of the mediocre and the indifferent. The Nation rests on the quality of its public men, and they in turn are shaped by the quality of American politics. Adlai Stevenson brought many individuals into government who have enriched the administrations of President Kennedy and President Johnson. But this is the least of it. More than any man, he created the citizen-politician. He told an entire generation there was room for intelligence and idealism in public life, that politics was not just a way to live but a way to live greatly, that each of us might share in the passions of the age.

My first experience in national politics was in an overflowing, chaotic room of the Volunteers for Stevenson. Many thousands had the same initiation. Today, the citizens groups, the volunteers, the clubs to discuss issues and the clubs to reform politics, are a force which every politician must confront, and which the best will welcome. Thus, he changed the face of American politics; enriching the democracy, providing a base on which talent could aspire to power, opening a gateway to public life through which many who never heard his voice will someday enter.

All these—ideas and men—are contributions to be remembered. But there was something more to Adlai Stevenson, a quality that resists thought and language alike. For none of this explains the fierce desire millions brought to his cause, the disappointed tears of many who never knew him, the deep impulse which could make even experienced politicians forget commitment and interest alike to be at his side.

It was not the first time we have seen this quality, nor the last. But how rare it is in those who find their way to power.

Part of it was in his lesson. It was not a new lesson. It runs like a vein of light through the dark history of the race. It suffuses the religion and beliefs of every people. It says that man is more than the sum of his needs and desires and fears. It ennobles those who look beyond their own interest to great principle. It acclaims, not wealth and power, but the charity of the spirit and the reach of the heart.

LOVE FELT BY MILLIONS

This is what he wanted for the American people. And although we may never be equal to it, many loved him for thinking we could.

The rest was the man himself. You didn't need to know him to feel it, although knowing brought confirmation. There was a gentleness, a spaciousness of sensibility, a love which in unseen ways was felt by millions. He could laugh and be cynical. If he read these words he would joke about them, and he would deride this writing with soft self-deprecation. But all the wonderful humor, the urbanity, the captiousness was, in large part, a mask to protect himself from a world which so easily confused humility with weakness, sentiment with unreality, amplitude of understanding with failure of will. Many who met him were fooled. Millions who never met him, knew the truth.

This is the secret of today's mourning and to his place in the play of passion clothed in fact which is history. People return what they receive. They believe in the man who believed in them and thus made them believe in themselves. They love the man who loved them and thus let them love themselves a little more. They honor the leader who told them they were better than they were and, in so doing, made it so.

He has often been compared to Hamlet. And those who make the comparison do so as a metaphor of irresolution. Hamlet is the story of a man who tries to understand and reach for certainty before he strikes. But he does strike—and for justice loses kingship and life while the election lights on a young and valiant captain.

Our judgment must echo Shakespeare's own when the new king stands beside Hamlet's body, saying:

"Let four captains

Bear Hamlet, like a soldier, to the stage;
For he was likely, had he been put on,
To have prov'd most royally."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 18, 1965]

HIS HERITAGE WAS PUBLIC SERVICE, SO HE RAN
(By Carl McGowan)

(NOTE.—Now a judge of the U.S. court of appeals here, McGowan was a friend of Adlai Stevenson for many years and served as counsel to the Governor of Illinois when Stevenson held that post from 1949 to 1953.)

I have always been a little surprised and puzzled by the recurring question of why Adlai Stevenson went into public life, especially as a seeker of elective office. It was asked by many people during his lifetime and, now that that record is closed, it comes to the fore again. It will continue to be put, I suspect, for a long time in the future. My bafflement derives from the fact that the question always seems to carry with it the unspoken but unmistakable implication of wonderment as to how a man of his literate and sensitive composition could possibly have been induced to intrude himself into the dust and heat of the political environment.

There is really no mystery about it, as he was always the first to say, although his own answers were always received with varying degrees of polite disbelief by those who thought the question significant.

I remember running into him once in 1947 when he was trying to settle down again in his old law firm after his wartime service with Col. Frank Knox at the Navy Department and his postwar service with the Department of State in getting the United Nations underway. In response to my query as to what he was up to, he replied that he seemed to be spending an inordinate amount of his nonlegal hours, to the despair of his friends and family, in going out to the West Side of Chicago to speak to Polish-American American Legion Post No. 80, or to the South Side to the young adults group of the Bethel Baptist Church, or to the North Side to the PTA of Public School No. 346. And then, with that wonderful wryly self-deprecatory smile, he said that he supposed he must either be running for office like mad or kidding himself that he wasn't.

HE KNEW HIMSELF

I thought then, as I think now, that he knew exactly what he was doing. Self-delusion was not one of his notable failings. He knew that he was responding to one of the deepest instincts of his background and being—that for public service. He knew also from his prior Washington experience, as many others have learned the same hard way, that the greatest opportunities for meaningful and effective public service reside in elective office. The shattering disappointments that beset that way of life can also be dissolved and made to seem as nothing in the satisfactions of feeling the reins of political power in one's hands harnessed to what one deeply believes to be good and just ends. The disappointments, as we now know, were to be his in cruel measure. But the satisfactions were his as well. And we need not doubt that he ever looked back with despair or regret at the angle at which the balance was struck.

It should be no cause for wonder that the way he chose was the political way. His family background was intensely political. His grandfather served in the high post of Vice President of the United States, and then philosophically absorbed the disasters of an unsuccessful second race for that office as well as for that of Governor of Illinois.

His father, Lewis Stevenson, although much less well-known, had political interest and acumen in plenty. When the Republican schism in 1912 threw that party into disarray, Illinois elected its first Catholic Governor in the person of Edward F. Dunne. When the secretary of state elected with Dunne suddenly died in office, Lewis Stevenson was appointed to finish the term.

On the ticket in his own right in 1916, he did not survive the flood of returning Republican power, but he did run so far ahead of the rest of the ticket as to make him a ponderable force in Democratic Party circles from that point forward, so much so that he was widely named in the eastern press as a serious possibility for second place on the national ticket in the 1920's. Only his sudden death, in a manner and at an age very similar to that of his son, ended that speculation.

NURTURED AT PRINCETON

The Stevenson family was, thus, saturated in politics at both the National and State levels. We would have more cause for amazement if the scion of the third generation in direct line of descent should have thought that he was above the battle, that what his father and grandfather had done was somehow beneath him. Their influence and their example, it may be surmised, was surely as strong as that of Princeton and La Salle Street.

Princeton, indeed, seems to have nurtured this predisposition and reinforced this family bent. For Adlai was of a generation of Princeton students who thrilled to the recent saga of Woodrow Wilson—that figure in whom the contrasting worlds of the university and the precinct have had their most dramatic confrontation and combination in our history as a nation.

Woodrow Wilson was a Democrat, and the Democrats of Illinois had played a vital role in winning for him the hotly contested nomination at Baltimore in 1912. Stevenson's family in Bloomington followed with the closest attention and the highest hopes the fluctuating fortunes of Wilson in the Presidency. It has been much the fashion to think of Adlai Stevenson as a latter-day analog of Woodrow Wilson. There are, of course, obvious disparities in personality and temperament, but there are many similarities in political style and, above all, in their vision of a just society at home and a peaceful one abroad, to the realization of which political power was to be mobilized and directed.

INFLUENCED BY WILSON

There can be no question that the youthful Stevenson was strongly influenced by this scholar in politics, and it is not idle to suppose that his own ideal of public service was not incompatible with the prospect of the college man asking the rank and file for their votes. As in the case of his immediate forebears, what was good enough for Woodrow Wilson was good enough for Adlai Stevenson.

And who can say that the dream, in terms of a world made safe for democracy, did not in its most secret recesses include a happier ending if the rocky road to political power could only be traversed once more by a man with the same vision and the same purpose to put that power to work in making it a reality?

Adlai Stevenson, far from receding from it in personal distaste, enjoyed politics. He savored with genuine relish the infinite variety of the people he met there. He found them, as in all other social and professional and educational and cultural circles in which

he moved, to be of all descriptions—good and bad, or, as is more often the case, partly good and partly bad. He had a particular liking for the latter, for he knew that most of us, including himself, fall into that group.

He found that in politics, arguably more than in other human activities, you cannot manage people by the book, if you try to, you will deny yourself some unexpected allies in time of need, and you will also rue some demoralizing failures by those whom you counted upon as allies. He sensed strongly that strain of sheer sentimentality which is just under the surface of political relationships and which binds together in a tacit brotherhood, often bigger than party or ideology, all those who live and die by the ballot box—a phenomenon of which the outsider is unaware and by the outward manifestations of which he is always surprised.

He learned that men in politics will often do what you want because they like you, and not because they like what you want. He brought to this highly emotional environment those qualities which, beneath all the surface toughness and cynicism, it valued the highest—a cheerful lightness of spirit, an artless gift for undemanding friendship, a lack of self-righteousness, a conviction that pigeonholes are for the birds, not fellow politicians perennially worried—and for the most creditable reasons—about the day after election day. He had the good political leader's surest instinct and most useful gift—that of trying to identify what the other fellow's problems and pressures are before writing him off in angry frustration.

It is, I think, one of the emptiest myths of our time that Adlai Stevenson was a political sport—an unhappy and uncomfortable accident in the unlikely milieu of professional politics, ill at ease with others who followed that trade, ineffective in his relationships with them because of his instinctive distaste for them and their way of life.

The error has been that of translating such things as superficial differences in dress and diction and working habits into fundamental hostilities and distrusts. The long-accepted stereotype of journalists and political scientists has been that of the patrician moving in ill-concealed discomfort among the less favored, and it has been the effortless path of least resistance to impose this pattern upon facts which, if looked at more closely, fairly trumpeted the mistake that was being made.

A State capital is, in political terms, surely one of the earthiest places to be found, particularly in a State like Illinois, where the central forces are a big city political machine and a host of shrewd and ever-watchful rural county chairmen. The Springfield story by itself is a thoroughgoing refutation of this myth.

When Governor Stevenson first appeared on the scene, there is no doubt that he presented an appearance that was well beyond the familiar experience of that locale.

During his first year in office, it was common to hear about the halls of the capital and in the hotel bars the bland assumption that he was an accident, a one-termer who would be retired to the lusher pastures of the North Shore without being reslated. By the end of the first year or so, this talk had disappeared completely and, if referred to at all, it was in the homely locution that he could not be beaten for a second term with a baseball bat. Indeed, the party's concern swiftly became of quite a different order, that is to say, would he be left alone by the national leaders to finish his work in Springfield, or would he be summoned to a greater effort on a grander scale?

This change in the prevailing wind in Springfield is, I have always thought, one of the most eloquent of tributes to Stevenson's all-embracing humanity. It came because the politicians found themselves treated as individuals in their own right. They found

that, under the Brooks Brothers suit, there was an adroit political leader, as dedicated as any of them to the welfare of the party and as assiduous as any of them in the advancement of its purposes. It was not a welfare which he confused with that of all the people of the State, but he began to demonstrate that the two are far from incompatible, and that there is, in the right hands, some meaning in the old saw that the best government is the best politics. He was, in short, realizing in action the motivations which made him more than ready to expose himself to the electorate in the first place.

The old pros, in the legislature and elsewhere, fairly glowed under his attentions. There was growing respect, of course, because they learned that they could not get all they wanted simply by staging explosive scenes in the privacy of his office. But when they went away empty-handed, as they often did, it was with the rancor reduced to a minimum, and the new formulation that took over in the cocktail lounges was that "you might not agree with everything the man on the second floor wants or asks, but you have to agree that he is a great little guy."

He was not the Pharisee lecturing them about what they ought to want or do. He was the fellow politician who had a big problem of his own in the shape of a responsibility to the entire people of Illinois. He took counsel with them about how his big problem and their smaller ones could somehow be fitted together. And the latter were not always made to yield, especially if there was some element of personal hardship involved for little people. I remember he signed a bill which saved the long-held jobs of six janitors in Chicago who had grown gray in the service of the Cook County organization generally and one veteran ward leader in particular. It violated every principle of the Civil Service Association and the League of Women Voters, and the newspapers were clamoring for a veto. When it was signed, I shall never forget the depth of emotion with which the ward leader expressed himself about this fellow, so unlike himself in every way, who had stuck his neck out for some people who were too old to start a new life and who looked to their oldtime leader for security in their time of trouble.

These are the little things of which political loyalties are compounded, and which can make or break the attainment of larger and infinitely more important programs. It is nonsense to say that the professionals uniformly disliked Stevenson. Two of the greatest of them all, Dave Lawrence of Pittsburgh and Dick Daley of Chicago, have been remarkable in their personal affection and political loyalty. There are many plain dwellings of precinct captains in Chicago where the grief is perhaps more deeply felt at this moment than in many of the drawing rooms farther north.

They liked him not only for his human appeal but because he lifted them up—he made their doorbell ringing seem more important. He communicated to them at least a dim sense of how the little fitted into the big, of how politics is always the handmaiden of public service. For this was his first and abiding principle, embedded in a family tradition and a personal conviction. It was the same spirit that caused his Grandmother Stevenson, when she lived in Washington as second lady of the land, to busy herself with promoting the cause of public education, and, in association with her friend and neighbor, Phoebe Hearst, organizing and launching the parent-teacher association movement. It is the same spirit which has put his oldest boy, Adlai III, into his first term in the Illinois General Assembly.

Why, then, did Adlai Stevenson run for office? The question should rather be: Why

would he not have run, when that course would have been untrue to his heritage and in conflict with every fiber of his being?

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, since Adlai Stevenson's sudden and untimely death in London last week, tributes have poured in from all over the world to this great public figure. One of the most eloquent of these was penned by Richard M. Goodwin, special assistant to the President, for the Sunday Outlook section of the Washington Post, July 18, 1965. Mr. Goodwin has written many brilliant lines in recent years, but he is at his best in this tribute to the late Governor Stevenson.

Mr. Goodwin said of Stevenson:

He told an entire generation there was room for intelligence and idealism in public life, that politics was not just a way to live, but a way to live greatly, that each of us might share in the passions of the age.

I was one of those who, along with Dick Goodwin, heard the call to politics through the words of Adlai Stevenson. Following the 1952 presidential campaign, I resigned a professorship at Dakota Wesleyan University to take on the task of rebuilding the Democratic Party in my State. I did so largely under the inspiration of Mr. Stevenson's stirring campaign of 1952. I think Mr. Goodwin has captured in words better than I ever could the reasons why he and I and millions of other Americans found our first real political inspiration in the late Adlai Stevenson.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Goodwin's article be printed at this point in the RECORD and that following this piece, these additional tributes to Stevenson appear in the RECORD: the text of the eulogy to Mr. Stevenson presented in the National Cathedral at the memorial service of Friday, July 16, by Judge Carl McGowan, as reprinted in the New York Times of July 17; an editorial in the Washington Post of July 15, entitled "Adlai Stevenson," an article by Mary McGrory, entitled "His Politics Had Gentility," appearing in the Washington Star of July 15; a feature article entitled "Freedom's Most Dedicated Champion," appearing in the Washington Star of July 18; an article by Betty Beale, entitled "He Left Behind a Marked Page on His Bedside Table," appearing in the Washington Star of July 18; and an editorial entitled "Stevenson's Rich Legacy" in the Sioux Falls, S. Dak. Argus-Leader of July 15, 1965.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
July 18, 1965]

HE NEVER LEARNED TO HIDE HIS SOUL

"We shall not come again
We never shall come back again
But over us all, over us all,
Over us all is—something."

—THOMAS WOLFE.

(By Richard N. Goodwin)

Twice he had come as close as a man could come to leadership of the American Nation. Yet no one noticed as, for a moment, Adlai Stevenson looked toward the caped statue of Franklin Roosevelt, walked a few hundred yards, grasped the thin steel columns of a sidewalk railing, and died.

Questions of man's survival, of war, and of human progress had very nearly rested on the qualities of his personal mind and will. The destiny of every man and woman he passed that afternoon was almost placed in his hand. Yet no one cheered or waved or even turned to stare.

For he had escaped power. And for a politician, power is the tool which etches out one man's figure from among his companions.

IMPRESSIVE QUALITIES

Would he have been a good leader of his country, or a great one? We will never know. Many deny it. And they give reasons which start to persuade, until we remember that they—or their counterparts in other years—had said the same of past leaders such as John Kennedy and Franklin Roosevelt and, most violently, of Abraham Lincoln.

The fact is no man who has not been President can survive analysis of his capacity for the task. Nor can we predict his qualities until they pass through the purification of power and responsibility. We do know he had more promise than most. We do know the impressive qualities of mind and spirit his career permitted him to reveal. We also know he was ambitious. For you do not run for President unless your ambitions are greater than those of other men.

Was that ambition tinged with self-doubt? It is for every man except the very dangerous. Did he have the courage of decision? His own words, public and in private conversation, cloud judgment. But perhaps they only mask the fact that never in his public life did he fail to decide when it was time to decide; except in 1960 when the shameful prospect of leading his party to a third defeat postponed judgment beyond the reach of action.

Where public issues were concerned he spoke—on the platform and in the meeting room—with a clarity of conviction few had courage to match. And on this question the judgment of those who knew him is disfigured by the tortured musings of a man who had never quite learned the trick of hiding his soul; whose confidence had been twisted and battered by defeat and by the indifference and contempt of lesser men, which finally killed him.

He was not, as some have said, marked by fate for failure. He was the victim of less mystical forces: bad luck, poor timing, unfortunate issues, a party too long in office, and an opponent who could not be defeated. Had 6 percent of American voters switched to him in 1952 then all the hesitation and humility would today be regarded as the skillful genius of a master politician.

So we do not know, and will never know, if Adlai Stevenson would have been a good President of the United States. But we must be reluctant to believe that the judgment of so many who had desired his victory so furiously could have been so wrong.

Great men of affairs are either kings or prophets. Very few are both. And honor comes more reluctantly to prophets because they touch us more deeply. Adlai Stevenson never became a king, but he was a prophet. Death is already beginning to dissolve the masks of public failure and private personality which hide that recognition. It will become clearer as the self-justifying commentaries of those who scorned him in life begin to fade.

SEED ON UNPLowed GROUND

I knew Adlai Stevenson as a colleague in my work for President Kennedy and, more recently for President Johnson. Both valued him most highly. Both had worked for his election to the office which they, not he, were to hold. Both knew, as others did not, what it took to bare yourself—ambitious and hopes—to the faithful, the indifferent and the hostile alike.

Many others in Washington, in these years, looked at him with a certain condescension. At times, thankfully only a few times, my own instinct was submerged in the need to be fashionable. But Adlai Stevenson will be mourned more deeply and remembered longer than any of these. It is not that millions loved him and millions more admired him because they did not know him. It is that closeness and ambition, envy, and rivalry obscure the heart's truth. Yet that is the truth that finally matters, which selects the man from among the shadows, sadly past the hour when recognition might bring personal joy.

But though I knew him and admired him, opposed him in 1960 and occasionally worked with him thereafter, many can speak far more intimately than I.

I remember best the Adlai Stevenson I never knew, when the world was young and the ringing phrases tumbled like the sowers seed on the unplowed ground.

In the fall of 1952 I was a senior in college in Massachusetts. John Kennedy was a young Congressman I had never met now running for the Senate. And Lyndon Johnson was the uncertainly familiar name of a Senator from Texas.

But Adlai Stevenson was my hero and my leader and my candidate for President of the United States. I never met him or even saw him, nor had I read the carefully crafted texts of his speeches. But something was in the air. My tiny world suddenly seemed to widen. Events and the course of history were drifting back within the reach of a man's skill and brains. The pursuit of power, and its use, were not solely the object of greed and vaulting ambition but infused with service and nobility and the love of others.

It wasn't that he talked sense or spoke the truth harshly. It was the more profound act of telling us—my generation—what we knew but didn't realize. He revealed a world we already sensed was there, bared challenges we were aching to undertake. The words were the words of sacrifice but the music sang of meaning and purpose to a young man.

As much as any, he was the end of post-war America and the beginning of a time still nameless. We knew and still repeated the old political phrases and the outworn battle cries. But we did not understand them because the lines had been drawn in a different war, and it was not our war. Now finally, there was a language we could understand and make our own.

THE ELEVATED INTELLIGENCE

Eight dreary, near tragic, years were to pass before that prophesy was to be fulfilled by different men. It is hard to overstate the extent to which he helped shape the dialog, and hence the purposes, of the New Frontier and then the Great Society. He dissolved the old, unserviceable simplicities and taught us to apply to the world the complex wisdom we have used so triumphantly in the affairs of our Nation: We could seek peace while resisting danger. Everyone who was not a friend was not an enemy. Agreement and accommodation could come from self-confidence as well as fear. By helping others we could strengthen ourselves. Particular problems could be resolved, but we must learn to live for generations with a troubled world. The contest was not simply between our system and communism, but between those who found security in dominion and those who found it in a world of strong and diverse lands.

And all these principles, and many more, he suffused with another welcome and shining truth: the pursuit of national self-interest was not inconsistent with the desire for justice and dignity and well-being for all the people of the world—that there was no basic unresolvable contradiction between realistic policies and high ideals.

To our domestic problems he brought the same elevated and critical intelligence. He told us our sights were too low, the course we had charted too narrow. In every area of our national life we not only could do more than we were doing but more than we thought. And he taught that wealth was not excellence, power was not greatness, the pursuit of abundance was not the pursuit of happiness.

After he spoke, no leader of his party nor the dialog of democracy itself, would ever sound the same again. He was eloquent and acclaimed for eloquence, but finally it was not how he spoke but what he said that mattered. Others would bring new accents and perhaps even greater powers to leadership. But it had all begun in Springfield, Ill., in that hopeful dawn year of 1952.

CITIZEN-POLITICIAN CREATED

The most farsighted policies molder and dissolve, lose content and direction, in the hands of the mediocre and the indifferent. The Nation rests on the quality of its public men, and they in turn are shaped by the quality of American politics. Adlai Stevenson brought many individuals into government who have enriched the administrations of President Kennedy and President Johnson. But this is the least of it. More than any man, he created the citizen-politician. He told an entire generation there was room for intelligence and idealism in public life, that politics was not just a way to live but a way to live greatly, that each of us might share in the passions of the age.

My first experience in national politics was in an overflowing, chaotic room of the volunteers for Stevenson. Many thousands had the same initiation. Today, the citizens groups, the volunteers, the clubs to discuss issues and the clubs to reform politics, are a force which every politician must confront, and which the best will welcome. Thus, he changed the face of American politics; enriching the democracy, providing a base on which talent could aspire to power, opening a gateway to public life through which many who never heard his voice will someday enter.

All these—ideas and men—are contributions to be remembered. But there was something more to Adlai Stevenson, a quality that resists thought and language alike. For none of this explains the fierce desire millions brought to his cause, the disappointed tears of many who never knew him, the deep impulse which could make even experienced politicians forget commitment and interest alike to be at his side.

It was not the first time we have seen this quality, nor the last. But how rare it is in those who find their way to power.

Part of it was in his lesson. It was not a new lesson. It runs like a vein of light through the dark history of the race. It suffuses the religion and beliefs of every people. It says that man is more than the sum of his needs and desires and fears. It ennobles those who look beyond their own interest to great principle. It acclaims, not wealth and power, but the charity of the spirit and the reach of the heart.

LOVE FELT BY MILLIONS

This is what he wanted for the American people. And although we may never be equal to it, many loved him for thinking we could.

The rest was the man himself. You didn't need to know him to feel it, although knowing brought confirmation. There was a gentleness, a spaciousness of sensibility, a love which in unseen ways was felt by millions. He could laugh and be cynical. If he read these words he would joke about them, and he would deride this writing with soft self-depreciation. But all the wonderful humor, the urbanity, the captiousness was, in large part, a mask to protect himself from a world which so easily confused hu-

manity with weakness, sentiment with unreality, amplitude of understanding with failure of will. Many who met him were fooled. Millions who never met him, knew the truth.

This is the secret of today's mourning and to his place in the play of passion clothed in fact which is history. People return what they receive. They believe in the man who believed in them and thus made them believe in themselves. They love the man who loved them and thus let them love themselves a little more. They honor the leader who told them they were better than they were and, in so doing, made it so.

He has often been compared to Hamlet. And those who make the comparison do so as a metaphor of irresolution. Hamlet is the story of a man who tries to understand and reach for certainty before he strikes. But he does strike: and for justice loses kingship and life while the election lights on a young and valliant captain.

Our judgment must echo Shakespeare's own when the new king stands beside Hamlet's body, saying:

"Let four captains
Bear Hamlet, like a soldier, to the stage;
For he was likely, had he been put on,
To have prov'd most royally."

[From the New York Times, July 17, 1965]

TEXT OF THE STEVENSON EULOGY

(NOTE.—Following is a transcript of the eulogy of Adlai Stevenson presented yesterday in the National Cathedral, Washington, by Judge Carl McGowan, as recorded by the New York Times.)

We are a vast company, we friends of Adlai Stevenson. Only a few of our total number are met here in Washington today to mourn him. More will come together for the same sad purpose in his homeland in Illinois. But all taken together will be but a very small part of the whole.

This is because in his case the word friend has a staggering sweep. It comprehends those who have had the benison of his personal presence to delight as well as to inspire. But it also includes literally millions in this country and abroad to whom he is only a voice.

It is a voice, however, to which they have listened since he began speaking in the accents of reason to the American people and as he has continued to do to the peoples of the entire world in the United Nations.

These people have in all their sorts and conditions of life, of high and low degree, of varying color and religions, listened to that voice with unabated interest and with undiminished respect. They have heard in it the unmistakable intonations of friendship. They have responded with the gift of their affection to a man most of them have never seen.

They are of our company of friends today, as much as any one of us here. We have all heard the same voice.

ECHOES IN HISTORY

That voice is still now. But its echoes are likely to be sounding down the corridors of history for a long time. For it is the essence of faith to believe that the world in its advancing age will set no less score than have we upon reason, upon intelligence, upon gaiety, upon charity and compassion and grace—all these things and more of and with which this voice has spoken to us so often and so clearly in the past.

We do not need now to be reminded of what we have lost. That hurt is deep and no one of us is too old to cry. We may better, then, give thanks for what we have had and rejoice in our recollections of how our good fortune came to be.

Many have asked how it was that a man of Governor Stevenson's sensibilities could have intruded himself into the dust and heat of

politics. We may think, I believe, that it was simply his joyous response to one of his deepest instincts—that for public service.

He knew that the greatest opportunities for effective public service lie in elective office. The shattering disappointments that beset that way of life can also dissolve in the satisfaction of feeling the reins of political power in one's hands harnessed to good and just ends.

The disappointments were his in cruel measure. But the satisfactions were his as well. We need not fear that he ever looked back with despairing regret at the way the final balance was struck.

FAMILY BENT FOR POLITICS

There was a strong family bent for politics and Adlai Stevenson was of a generation of Princeton students who thrilled to the saga of Woodrow Wilson—that figure in our history in whom the contrasting worlds of the university and the precinct have had their most dramatic conjunction.

In this cathedral the spirit of Woodrow Wilson is always very close. Surely it has never been more so than at this moment. The youthful admirer has completed the course with honor and is at rest with the admired.

The two have often been compared; although there are obvious disparities in temperament, there are many similarities in political styles. Above all, they had a common vision of a just society at home and a peaceful one abroad. Both were agreed that the mobilization and direction of political power was a pursuit from which no man should turn away or of which he should be ashamed.

And who can say that the dream of the youthful Stevenson in terms of a world made safe for democracy did not include a happier ending, if only the rocky road to political power could be traversed once more by a man with the same vision.

Adlai Stevenson enjoyed politics. He relished the infinite variety of people he met there. He found them to be, as in other walks of life, of all descriptions, good and bad, and, more frequently, partly good and partly bad.

He had a particular liking for these last, for he knew that most of us, including himself, are in that group. He sensed that strain of sentimentality which is always just under the surface of political relationships and which binds together in a tacit brotherhood all those who live and die by the ballot box.

He brought to this highly emotional environment his own warm responses, shaped by those qualities which, beneath all the surface toughness and cynicism, it valued the highest, a cheerful lightness of spirit, a gift for undemanding friendship, a sympathetic understanding that most politicians have creditable reasons for worrying about the day after election day.

He had the expert political leader's sure instinct for trying to identify the other fellow's problems and pressures before passing judgment upon him. The Stevenson story has now become a legend. The glories of it are many, but none shines more brightly than the sight of him putting to work at the United Nations these very qualities which rocketed him to the foreground of domestic politics.

It was as if he were fated to move through personal disappointment to the very center of the problems that assail all people and upon which depend the survival of civilization itself.

LIFETIME OF PREPARATION

His whole life has been a preparation for events of this scale of importance. And our sense of the fitness of things must be touched by this completely civilized man doing battle for the persistence of the very idea of civilization. For our biggest stake

we put forward our best. And he met the challenge, to our and his eternal honor.

If there is reason to be despairing on this day it is because this man has been removed from the important work of war and peace. But he who knew the perils ahead better than most, was undaunted by them.

In virtually the last of his magnificent speeches he gave to the world he said: "For all our desperate dangers I do not believe in the words of Winston Churchill that 'God has despaired of His children.'"

Wherefore, then, are we now to falter and be faint of heart. We have lost a friend; but all the world has lost one. And that friend has left us in the fullness of his powers and secure in what he must have known to be a far-flung respect and affection.

He died as he would have wished, engaged in his country's business, and mankind's.

[From The Washington (D.C.) Post, July 15, 1965]

ADLAI STEVENSON

He was a man without malice in an age in which public enterprise and international affairs were largely disfigured by malice. He was a man of great warmth of spirit and largeness of heart in an era marked by cold calculation and selfishness. He was a man of humor and wit in an interval of national life during which such talents in public men inspired suspicion. He was a man of humility in a season when those with more occasion to have it possessed none of it. He was a man whose utterance, like Jefferson's, was always felicitous and graceful and often beautifully eloquent. He was a man given to introspection and soul searching in an interval of history preempted by men of action.

For these qualities he was idolized by millions of Americans, respected by more and looked upon abroad as an embodiment of the best democratic impulses and values of American life. His death in London yesterday must have had an impact upon most citizens as great as that ordinarily arising from the loss of a head of state. Upon many it inflicted a sense of deprivation like that felt at the loss of a close friend or a member of the family circle.

In his long and controversial public life he was the object of many reproaches but few dared to say, and none could say with justice, that he was not a good man in the sense that he was forever governed in his words and in his acts by the wish to further the good of his country, the well-being of his countrymen, the fair name of his Nation at home and abroad. It is doubtful if there is any man in our history of whom it could be as safely asserted that he never permitted private interest to conflict with what he understood as the public good. And this, when spoken of him, is higher praise than it would be of other men, for he had no capacity for that subtle self-deceit that permits men to identify their own and the public weal.

On this occasion many will regret that he did not achieve the high office which twice he sought. It is easy to imagine small changes in circumstance that would have made him President. But the regret must be tempered. No one knew better than he the anguish of power—and he would have suffered in it, not rejoiced in it. When he addressed the American Society of Newspaper Editors in 1960 he described the search for truth as a "principle" of our national life. He said: "In this striving, it is a matter of experience that some strains are almost too great for human fortitude—and of these strains, none is more testing than that of prolonged and unquestioned power." Probably few candidates for our highest office have had the same awareness of this aspect of the ordeal of public office.

On that occasion he spoke on the role of the opposition in American public life and rightly and wisely declared: "The possibility of alternating the Government, which only the acceptance of opposition secures, is essential to the health of both, to those who govern and to those who would. If succession to power is the consequence of successful criticism, this fact, in itself, should sober the critics, keep their attacks within the limits of the practicable, weight them with the sense of coming responsibility, weaken the pull of the lunatic fringe." That is the kind of opposition leader that he always was.

His public life was capped by his great career at the United Nations. He must have found this an anguishing public service for a man of his sensitive nature, his preference for restrained utterance, his passionate faith in his own country and his contempt for extravagant demagoguery. But he suffered its adversity patiently and without complaint or protest, serving to the end at the task to which he was summoned, however distasteful it was to him.

He was often asked, as men so gifted often are, to speak in praise of others—his colleagues, his President, his friends, his rivals. His gift of eloquent speech was not withheld, but he must have wished in his own wry way, that he could have struck a better bargain and have heard more words in praise of himself. So it is that now there is none to speak of him as eloquently as he would have spoken of others. In this, as in every aspect of his life, he gave more than he received.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, July 15, 1965]

THE PERFECT KNIGHT: HIS POLITICS HAD GENTILITY

(By Mary McGrory)

Adlai Stevenson was a gentleman from Illinois who entered politics late in life, suffered two crushing national defeats, and retired gracefully from the scene. He was an incomparable orator and, as a candidate, so diffident, so civil and so mannerly, so insistent on his own values that he might go down as a noble footnote in the history of his times.

But he was more than that. Despite the brevity of that career, it was crucial. He left his mark on American politics. His two successors used the bold ideas he had given them. They put to work the superior breed of men he had attracted to public service.

And all over America, in every political subdivision, there are men and women who lick stamps and ring doorbells and attend grubby meetings because 13 years ago the sound of Stevenson's voice, enunciating precisely a high-minded, high-hearted vision of public life, galvanized them permanently.

There has not been in memory a politician like him. He was unique because he insisted on the ultimate luxury most politicians immediately forgo—that of being completely himself in public.

Stevenson was a contradictory man: troubled yet merry; committed yet detached; idealistic yet rueful. He had a puritan sense of duty without a puritan self-righteousness and a reformer's zeal without the reformer's scourge.

His campaigns were the despair of the professionals and the delight of his followers. No candidate before nomination protested more articulately his own inadequacies. And no candidate spoke with more felicity and fire and wit.

Who would have thought the gently nurtured aristocrat would tread so heavily on the toes of the pressure groups—the American Legion, the labor movement, the Old South?

While his soldier-citizen rival held out the promise of painless peace, Stevenson

campaigned on the premise that life is hard and the world is in ferment.

The speeches of the 1952 campaign did not win the White House for Stevenson. But they did win him a place in literature.

He paid a high price. When he might have been glad handing, he was reworking his phrases. No audience was too small to merit his best.

The memory of him on the platform is of a middle-aged man with a hole in his shoe, up to the moment of introduction frowningly busy with pencil on the script of the address. The English language had no more valiant or perfectionist friend. Stevenson retained to the end his belief in the power of words.

Political power eluded him, at least on the national scene. As Governor of Illinois, he seemed to understand all about it. But he had been brought up in a rigid creed of gentility, and he never could command the fighting excesses which the politician must use. In 1956, when the late Senator Estes Kefauver challenged him for the nomination and defeated him in the Minnesota primary, Stevenson went on the warpath in California, but for him it was a joyless and unpalatable enterprise.

In 1960, he was of two minds. While he characteristically deprecated his own chances, he knew the unalterable loyalty of his partisans. And despite his public manifestations to the contrary, Stevenson always knew his own worth. He would not give his followers the word.

The high point of the Los Angeles convention was the nominating speech of Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, who, for Stevenson, reached the oratorical heights of the master.

"Do not," he cried, "reject this man who has made us all proud to be called Democrats," and the galleries went mad. "Do not leave this prophet without honor in his own party."

Stevenson, deprived of the great prize a third time, hoped that John F. Kennedy would make him Secretary of State. But Kennedy wanted to be his own Secretary of State and wanted no Cabinet officer with so fierce a personal following. Instead, he asked Stevenson to be Ambassador to the United Nations.

Stevenson had no enthusiasm for the job, but impelled both by the desire to serve and the reluctance to leave public life, which both repelled and attracted him, accepted.

It was a thankless chore, and Stevenson seemed always on the point of giving it up. He used to tell his friends he could not go on—and did. He would say the problems were impossible—and he coped with them.

He was sustained by the near reverence tendered him by the representatives of other countries who found in him a symbol of his own country's honor and integrity and good will.

His hold on the imagination of many Americans never weakened. At the 20th anniversary celebration of the United Nations in San Francisco, there were some who came, not to see President Johnson but to see Adlai Stevenson, who was to them, as Senator MCCARTHY said, quoting Chaucer, "a very perfect gentle knight."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star,
July 18, 1965]

FREEDOM'S MOST DEDICATED CHAMPION

It was a warm, sunny afternoon in London last Wednesday.

Adlai Stevenson, in England since the previous Saturday on a trip that combined diplomatic business and social pleasure, stepped through the door of the U.S. Embassy on Upper Grosvenor Square. With him was Mrs. Marietta P. Tree, a longtime friend and fellow member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations.

The two strolled slowly along. They neared the International Sportsmen's Club, some 50 yards from the Embassy. Suddenly, Stevenson fell backward to the pavement.

The time was 5:10 p.m., London time.

Mrs. Tree dropped to her hands and knees beside him, calling for help. The doorman from the nearby club ran out, gently lifted Stevenson's head and placed a folded coat beneath it. Mrs. Tree bent down and tried to restore his breathing by mouth-to-mouth resuscitation. A doctor ran up and applied artificial respiration.

Moments later an ambulance arrived. Oxygen was administered on the brief trip to St. Georges Hospital at Hyde Park.

Word of the incident was relayed to the Embassy. An official called the hospital to check on Stevenson's condition. While the official was identifying himself to a nurse, a doctor's voice broke in.

"I have just now signed the death certificate," the doctor said.

The time was 5:25 p.m.

Stevenson's lifetime of dedication to his country and to the cause of freedom had ended in his 66th year. There had been no hint of the massive coronary thrombosis that apparently struck with such blinding swiftness that Stevenson was dead even as he slumped to the pavement.

Word of Stevenson's death was flashed from the Embassy at about 1 p.m. Washington time. And his nation and the world began the inevitable reflect of reevaluating the man who was gone and of estimating the loss that had been suffered.

President Johnson was told of Stevenson's death as he prepared for a state luncheon at the White House for Japanese Cabinet members. He rose from his place to deliver what may have been the most eloquent impromptu statement of his career.

"This is our legacy from Adlai Stevenson—a charge to continue the quest for a decent world, for a better world order, for a life for man that is free of war and destruction and oppression of his spirit.

"So this is our pledge to the memory of this great man * * * a pledge to devote our energies and our talents and our resources and our wills to the cause for which he died.

"We realize that America has lost its foremost advocate and its most eloquent spirit and one of the finest voices for peace in the world. The world of freedom has lost, I think, perhaps its most dedicated champion."

Those near the President reported his eyes were filled with tears.

The body of the man who was twice rejected for the Presidency was flown from London in the Presidential jet, accompanied by the Vice President and by Stevenson's three sons. Expressions of shock and grief poured in from heads of state and from ordinary citizens throughout the world.

Through the night from Thursday to Friday morning, the body lay in the Washington Cathedral. A steady stream of mourners passed slowly by the coffin, paying their final tribute to the man who, in defeat, had elevated American politics and who had inspired a generation of dedicated young men to enter service of their country.

On Saturday, the body was taken to Springfield, Ill., to lie in state in the capitol where Stevenson served as Governor. A private funeral and burial in the family plot in Bloomington, Ill., is scheduled for tomorrow.

And along with the grief and the shock over the sudden death of the witty, articulate, thoughtful, and dedicated man, the Nation and the President were left with a very real void and with the need to fill it promptly and well.

Stevenson had served his country with outstanding ability as Ambassador to the United Nations since 1961. It was known among the friends that he had for some time been considering retirement; as he put it to Columnist Eric Sevareid the Monday before his death,

"I'd like to sit in the shade with a glass of wine in my hand and watch the dancers." What stopped him from leaving his post was the realization that the U.N. was in trouble and the fear that his withdrawal might further diminish the organization's sagging prestige.

His death precipitated the crisis he had sought to avoid.

Within minutes of the shocking announcement, the speculation had started as to who Johnson would name to fill the post. For the moment, Francis T. P. Plimpton, Stevenson's second in command, would step up. But the President would have to move soon to name a permanent replacement for the man who had brought so much prestige to the post.

Whoever the choice might fall upon, one thing was certain: The most able advocate of American policies—even those with which he was not in full accord—was lost to his Nation last Wednesday.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star,
July 18, 1965]

HE LEFT BEHIND A MARKED PAGE ON HIS BEDSIDE TABLE (By Betty Beale)

For those of us who admired and loved Adlai Stevenson it is not easy to say goodbye.

He was such a unique, towering figure on the scenes chronicled on these pages. His great vitality of intellect, heart, soul and wit had an electric effect on every gathering he attended.

The picture of him as a lonely, frequently gloomy man, as portrayed in the Ben Shahn sketch on the cover of Time in December 1962, was for his intimate friends a totally false one.

He was a blithe spirit that delighted in so many things—an active useful life, the beauty of art, music and poetic words, humor wherever it might be found, and the kindnesses of people, big and little, scores of whom were so deeply devoted to him he had no time for loneliness.

Indeed, the social demands on his time were so much greater than the possibility of fulfillment he not infrequently became involved in two engagements the same evening in different cities.

His housekeeper, Violet Ready, who served his family during his mother's lifetime and was with him all the time he was U.N. Ambassador, could find no basis for the gloomy portrayal. He loved people, he had them around him all the time, and he kept up a personal correspondence with dozens more. If the tragedies of his personal life or the turn of world events depressed him at times, he quickly rose about them.

Indeed his sense of humor gave him a much gayer outlook on life than the average man's. Nor did his wit depend on speechwriters, as is so often the case with public men. There was that unforgettable time at a party for Lady Astor on her last visit to Washington when she said to him:

"You need me. I'm a rich widow."

And he immediately whipped back:

"I'm looking for somebody more mature."

He could even jest about Russia's hostility, although the strain of continuously coping with it is what really took his life. The night he took Soviet Ambassador and Mrs. Dobrynin to the Bolshoi Ballet opening in New York the Russian envoy was telling how his wife took pictures of sunsets everywhere she went in the United States.

"The picture of dying America, I suppose," was Adlai's amused comment.

Anyone who watched him at social gatherings soon became aware that he had but one manner toward all. It was the manner of grace and ease and warmth, and it came to him as naturally as breathing.

He was never rude or brusque with people, never impatient with boredom, though he was frequently detained by people he would

gladly have escaped. He didn't think he was so important he could offend others.

It was perhaps this humility as much as anything that kept him from becoming President. As someone recently said: "You have to have ego to become President"—to think you are better qualified than all other men to run the country.

That is why it took a draft to get him in the race in 1952.

About a year ago he told this writer that Bobby Kennedy had come to him asking for his support of his brother at the Democratic convention in 1960 and offering him the Vice Presidency if he would nominate Jack Kennedy for President.

"I would be President today," he observed thoughtfully, but he had given his word to Johnson, he said, that he would remain neutral and not come out for either candidate.

On the incident of the much discussed selection by Kennedy of a running mate, Stevenson threw this light some time ago.

"Jack Kennedy called me early the morning after his nomination and said he wanted to come and talk to me. I told him that I would come to him and I got dressed and went over right away. He asked me what I thought about Lyndon Johnson for Vice President."

Stevenson told him that he thought it would heal the breach in the Democratic Party, that Johnson would help win the South and that he would be of enormous assistance in dealing with the Congress.

"But," he added, "of course, he won't take it."

He was surprised when Johnson did.

It is hard to believe that Stevenson said, as has been reported, that our Santo Domingo policy was "a massive blunder from beginning to end." Six weeks ago he said only that this country's mistake was in not waiting 24 hours to present our plan to the OAS. The 24-hour wait would not have been detrimental and would have given our position strength and support.

That Stevenson was feeling the strain of a 17-hour day almost every day in the week was apparent in recent months by his comments, not by any evidence of mental fatigue. Associates said that no matter how tired he might be physically, his mind always functioned at top lucidity.

He told the Roosevelt family last January that he would have to resign from the chairmanship of the Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation because it was killing him to try to do a good job with that along with everything else he had to do.

It is nice to know that he had a rare weekend with his grandchildren at his farm in Libertyville 10 days before his passing. After "a whirlpool for months," he called it "a quiet eddy" with "only six children under 14 and underfoot."

When he took off for Geneva he left behind on the bedside table in his New York apartment a printed page that he had marked.

Perhaps it was intended for a commencement address. It was not written by him but that he chose it and saved it for his attention upon his return is indicative of his own thought. It was entitled "Desiderata," and it was found in old St. Paul's Church, Baltimore, dated 1692.

He once said, "You cannot pluck out the mystery of the human heart." But perhaps this gives more insight into the mystery of his:

"Go placidly amid the noise and the haste and learn what peace there may be in silence * * *. Speak your truth quietly and clearly; and listen to others, even the dull and ignorant; they, too, have their story. * * * If you compare yourself with others you may become vain and bitter; for always there will be greater and lesser persons than yourself.

"Enjoy your achievements as well as your plans. Keep interested in your career, however humble; it is a real possession in the changing fortunes of time. Exercise caution in your business affairs; for the world is full of trickery. But let this not blind you to what virtue there is; many persons strive for high ideals; and everywhere life is full of heroism.

"Be yourself. Especially do not feign affection. Neither be cynical about love; for in the face of all aridity and disenchantment it is as perennial as the grass. Take kindly the counsel of the years, gracefully surrendering the things of youth. Nurture strength of spirit to shield you in sudden misfortune. But do not distress yourself with imaginings. Many fears are born of fatigue and loneliness. Beyond a wholesome discipline, be gentle with yourself. You are a child of the universe no less than the trees and the stars; you have a right to be here. And whether or not it is clear to you no doubt the universe is unfolding as it should.

"Therefore, be at peace with God, whatever you conceive Him to be. And whatever your labors and aspirations in the noisy confusion of life keep peace with your soul. With all its sham, drudgery, and broken dreams, it is still a beautiful world."

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader, July 15, 1965]

STEVENSON'S RICH LEGACY

As twice a candidate for the Presidency, Adlai Stevenson never won the majority of the American people. But he did win a warm place in the hearts of the citizens. Even those who disagreed sharply with his policies respected his sincerity, his good purpose and his eager desire to be of service.

He was a man of charm—a gentleman in the real sense of the word. He also was a citizen of integrity and character, able and willing to speak vigorously in defense of that in which he believed.

His life was dedicated in the main to public service both in his home State of Illinois and in the Nation. He became a broad student of world affairs and many in Washington respected deeply his profound understanding of the international problems and his intense and earnest effort to promote peace.

Many of his critics felt he was too much of an idealist, too much of a dreamer. But surely the Nation requires in high places some persons of prominence whose thoughts are unfettered by tradition and who can turn their eyes toward objectives difficult to achieve.

Perhaps Stevenson was too ready to expect extreme accomplishments. Yet all of us were enriched by the program he laid out and the goals he had in mind.

By any and all standards, he is to be remembered as one of America's good citizens—one of the best.

Mr. MONTOLA. Mr. President, I was out of the country at the Parliamentary Conference in Lima, Peru, when the shocking news of Ambassador Stevenson's death reached me.

I am deeply sorry that I was unable to return in time to attend the memorial services, but on the other hand I feel confident, that he, of all the men I know, would have understood.

American foreign policy was the subject nearest and dearest to his heart. Adlai Stevenson understood the importance of face-to-face meetings such as the one in Lima to the achievement of our goal of improved relations among nations.

He carried his heavy responsibilities with unflagging wit and verve and dedication. Under other circumstances, he

would have led this Nation as well as serving as one of the chief exponents of her foreign policy.

But even if he had achieved the supreme gift of office which this country's citizens can bestow upon a man, I doubt that he could have been any more effective an advocate of our Nation's constant goal of a decent peaceful life for all the people of this world.

That he made this case with remarkable skill and clarity is shown by the admiration, and even reverence, in which he is held in other countries.

Like few other statesmen, Adlai Stevenson exemplified to the world the best that is in this country.

He will be sorely missed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

COLD WAR VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT RELATING TO CONSTRUCTION OF HEALTH RESEARCH FACILITIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2984) to amend the Public Health Service Act provisions for construction of health research facilities by extending the expiration date thereof and providing increased support for the program, to authorize additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and agree to the request of the House for a conference,

and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HILL, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. PELL, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. MURPHY conferees on the part of the Senate.

PERSONNEL FOR COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2985) to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HILL, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. PELL, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. MURPHY conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION AND AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 510) to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, and for other purposes which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Community Health Services Extension Amendments of 1965".

IMMUNIZATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 2. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 317 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "and" before "June 30, 1965" and by inserting "and each of the next three fiscal years," immediately after "June 30, 1965." The second sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out "the fiscal years ending June 30, 1963, and June 30, 1964" and inserting in lieu thereof "any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1968". The third sentence of such subsection is amended by striking "and tetanus" and inserting in lieu thereof "tetanus, and measles", and by striking out "under the age of five years" and inserting in lieu thereof "of preschool age".

(b) Subsection (a) of such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Such grants may also be used to pay similar costs in connection with immunization programs against any other disease of an infectious nature which the Surgeon finds represents a major public health problem in terms of high mortality, morbidity, disability, or epidemic potential and to be susceptible of practical elimination as a public health problem through immunization with vaccines or other preventive agents which may become available in the future."

(c) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out "of limited duration", by striking out "against poliomyelitis, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus" and inserting in lieu thereof "against the diseases referred to in subsection (a)", and by striking out "who are under the age of five years" and inserting in lieu thereof "of preschool age".

(d) (1) Such section is further amended by striking out "intensive community vaccination" wherever it appears in subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "immunization".

(2) The heading of such section is amended by striking out "INTENSIVE VACCINATION" and inserting in lieu thereof "IMMUNIZATION".

MIGRATORY WORKERS HEALTH SERVICES

SEC. 3. Section 310 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof "each fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1968".

GENERAL PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES

SEC. 4. The first sentence of subsection (c) of section 314 of such Act is amended by striking out "first five fiscal years ending after June 30, 1961" and inserting in lieu thereof "first six fiscal years ending after June 30, 1961".

SPECIAL PROJECT GRANTS FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES

SEC. 5. The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 316 of such Act is amended by striking out "first five fiscal years ending after June 30, 1961" and inserting in lieu thereof "first six fiscal years ending after June 30, 1961".

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment and request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HILL, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. PELL, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. MURPHY conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COLD WAR VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6 it is proposed to strike out line 7, as follows: "§ 1911. Duration of veteran's education or training

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

"§ 1910. Entitlement to education or training generally

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have received a letter in support of S. 9 from the State of California, signed by H. E. Summers, chief, bureau of readjustment education, department of education, dated July 14, 1965. It reads as follows:

JULY 14, 1965.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: The following data is submitted for your information to emphasize the urgency and need for the enactment of cold war veterans educational benefits as provided in your Senate bill 9.

Between February 1, 1955, and June 30, 1965, there have been 82,792 inducted into the military service, and 415,497 enlistments or Reserves ordered to active duty for a total of 498,289 cold war service personnel from the State of California. For the same period, February 1, 1955, through June 30, 1965, there have been 530,478 military personnel released from active duty in California.

The California State Department of Employment has indicated that 5 percent of the overall employable population is presently unemployed. The best available figures for the personnel who have been released from military service since February 1, 1955, indicates an unemployment percentage of more than 10 percent. This disproportionate percentage of unemployment for the cold war service personnel is the result of a lack of specific contacts with job possibilities because of their being in the service and away from their home environment for the period of time spent on military duty. Another factor is that persons entering the military service, either voluntarily or by induction, have done so prior to their completing educational or vocational training, and upon their returning to civilian life they are untrained for specific employment and are also financially unable to pursue vocational or educational training in public or private schools. It should be pointed out that many young people are unable to secure employment if they have not completed their military service when eligible for the draft as many employers find it to their disadvantage to hire an individual subject to military duty. The employer feels that it is not economically sound to spend time in training an employee until there is some assurance of his continued employment. This then results in unemployment prior to entering the service as well as a more difficult period of adjustment to civilian life and pursuit of employment after release from military duty.

Service personnel returning to civilian life are seriously handicapped in that they are unable to save enough in the way of finances to continue their education and training and in turn have to compete with those who have remained in civilian life to secure further education or seniority in the labor market.

We trust that the President and the administration are aware this injustice exists and will fully support this legislation. You are to be commended on the interest and persistence that you have shown on behalf of the cold war service personnel. Existing Federal legislation does not provide the necessary assistance to our cold war service personnel and it is urged that educational benefits be enacted.

Very truly yours,

H. E. SUMMERS,
Chief, Bureau of Readjustment Education.

Mr. President, I thank Mr. Summers, Chief of the Bureau of Readjustment

Education of the California State Department of Education, for his concise statement on the bill. I also pay tribute to the great State of California, a State of 18 million people, which will have furnished 530,478 military personnel, who have been released from active duty between January 1, 1955, and June 30, 1965. In that 10-year period more than a half million young men have come back from service. Among those persons the rate of unemployment is nearly twice the rate among young men who did not serve.

Mr. President, many of those called up to serve in this cold war do not go overseas. While Regulars are being sent overseas, many of our Reserves and the National Guard are called to replace them at home. They are taken out of their places of business and their lives are disrupted.

An article appeared on page A-15 of the Washington Post on Friday, July 16, 1965, captioned "Joint Chiefs Want Vietnam Force of 179,000 This Year."

The article names some specific reserves, and states:

The armed services, it was disclosed, are starting to gear up for such possible muster of guardsmen and reservists.

They have submitted to Defense officials tentative estimates totaling more than 200,000 citizen servicemen.

Those men will be called out of their normal employment for Reserve and National Guard duties to fill in for the 179,000 men of the Regular services going overseas.

This breakdown, as shown by the article, is:

About 120,000 guardsmen and reservists, including six infantry brigades. Three of these brigades, sources said, probably would be the 187th of Massachusetts, the 157th of Pennsylvania, and the 205th of Minnesota.

Mr. President, if those men are called up to replace the men going overseas, their lives will be disrupted as much as were the lives of those called for action in Korea, Okinawa, or Vietnam, and who did not get there.

This is not a bonus bill for combat. This is a readjustment for servicemen. It enables them to readjust and learn how to earn a living when they get back into civilian life rather than to go on expensive relief rolls of the unemployed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article to which I have referred in the Washington Post of July 16, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT CHIEFS WANT VIETNAM FORCE OF 179,000 THIS YEAR

(By Fred S. Hoffman)

The Nation's military chiefs have recommended unanimously that the strength of U.S. forces in South Vietnam be boosted to 179,000 men by the end of the year, it was learned yesterday.

This would be more than 100,000 above the 75,000-man U.S. force now scheduled to be in South Vietnam.

This recommendation by the Joint Chiefs of Staff will be considered by top U.S. officials in the light of what Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara determines during his

weeklong inspection visit to Vietnam. McNamara left Washington Wednesday night.

(In Saigon early Friday, McNamara denied that the Joint Chiefs had unanimously recommended an increase of combat troops—he did not mention other forces—but then added that use of American combat troops was one of the prime reasons of his trip.)

The Associated Press was told the Joint Chiefs would include the remainder of the 1st Infantry division in the new projections for a buildup to meet growing Communist strength. One brigade of that division landed in Vietnam this week after traveling from its home base at Ft. Riley, Kans.

A buildup as big as 179,000 men could well bring at least a limited mobilization of Reservists and National Guardsmen to replace regular troops drawn into the growing conflict in Vietnam.

ARE GEARING UP

The armed services, it was disclosed, are starting to gear up for such possible muster of guardsmen and reservists.

They have submitted to Defense officials tentative estimates totaling more than 200,000 citizen servicemen.

The breakdown:

About 120,000 guardsmen and reservists, including 6 infantry brigades. Three of these brigades, sources said, probably would be the 187th of Massachusetts, the 157th of Pennsylvania and the 205th of Minnesota.

Marines: The 4th Marine Division and its air wing, a total of more than 44,000 reservists.

Navy: About 40,000 reservists who would be summoned as individuals rather than with units.

Air Force: Mostly air transport squadrons manned by some 20,000 reservists and guardsmen.

COULD BE SCALED DOWN

The sources emphasize that the planning for a possible callup is still in the early stages and that the services estimates could be scaled down.

The Chicago Daily News Service reported the total manpower available for a possible callup:

The United States, at present, has a total of 2,600,000 men in its Regular Armed Forces.

If it should prove necessary to call up 250,000 Reservists, there would still be a large reservoir of manpower left. The Ready Reserve Force, which is the first to go, totals 1,700,000 men.

This is composed of 383,000 Army National Guardsmen, 714,000 Army reservists, 329,000 naval reservists, 102,000 Marine Corps reservists, 72,000 Air National Guardsmen, and 182,000 Air Force reservists.

This pool is subject to callup in time of war, in time of a national emergency proclaimed by the President, or in the event of a national emergency proclaimed by Congress.

In addition to the Ready Reserve, there are 463,000 men in the Standby Reserve. They can only be ordered to active duty by action of Congress.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I submit an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill.

My substitute is printed as S. 520, and it is an amended form, but in substantially the same form as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Senate for Friday, June 16, on page 17128, in the last column, and on the succeeding pages.

I submit my amendment in the nature of a substitute, and ask unanimous con-

sent that it be printed, so that it will be available in the printed form tomorrow, or as soon as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask that it be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll; and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 188 Leg.]

Aiken	Hart	Mundt
Allott	Hartke	Murphy
Anderson	Hayden	Muskie
Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Nelson
Bass	Hill	Pastore
Bayh	Holland	Pearson
Bennett	Inouye	Pell
Bible	Jackson	Prouty
Boggs	Jordan, Idaho	Proxmire
Burdick	Kennedy, Mass.	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, N.Y.	Robertson
Cannon	Kuchel	Russell, Ga.
Carlson	Lausche	Russell, S.C.
Case	Long, Mo.	Saltonstall
Church	Long, La.	Scott
Clark	Magnuson	Simpson
Cooper	Mansfield	Smathers
Cotton	McCarthy	Smith
Curtis	McClellan	Stennis
Dirksen	McGee	Symington
Dodd	McGovern	Talmadge
Dominick	McIntyre	Thurmond
Ellender	McNamara	Tower
Fannin	Mondale	Tydings
Fong	Monroney	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	Montoya	Williams, Del.
Gore	Morse	Yarborough
Gruening	Morton	Young, N. Dak.
Harris	Moss	Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] are absent on official business.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

THE CONSTITUTION MUST NOT BE AMENDED IN HASTE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, last week the distinguished minority leader had printed in the RECORD the revised text of his constitutional amendment to permit one house of a State legislature to be malapportioned.

This, Mr. President, is the third "official draft" of the so-called Dirksen amendment. In order that the RECORD may conveniently reflect the changes that have been made, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of Senate Joint Resolution 2 as it was introduced.

There being no objection, the text of Senate Joint Resolution 2 was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

The right and power to determine the composition of the legislature of a State and the apportionment of the membership thereof shall remain in the people of that State. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit the people from apportioning one house of a bicameral legislature upon the basis of factors other than population, or from giving reasonable weight to factors other than population in apportioning a unicameral legislature, if, in either case, such apportionment has been submitted to a vote of the people in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution and has been approved by a majority of those voting on that issue.

SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, at the conclusion of hearings, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, which has held hearings for some weeks and months, reported a revised amendment which reflects substantial changes from the original text of Senate Joint Resolution 2. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the *RECORD* at this point.

There being no objection, the revised amendment was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years of the date of its submission to the Congress:

SECTION 1. The people of a State may apportion one house of a bicameral legislature upon the basis of factors other than population, or give reasonable weight to factors other than population in apportioning a unicameral legislature, if, in either case, such apportionment has been submitted to a vote of the people in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution and has been approved by a majority of those voting on that issue.

SEC. 2. Any State which has approved an apportionment plan under this Article shall resubmit it to a vote of its people at the general election next following the year in which there is commenced any enumeration provided for in section 2 of article I, and upon approval by a majority of those voting on that issue, such plan shall continue in effect until changed in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution. If not so approved, it shall remain in effect for a period of not exceeding two years from that general election or until the earlier adoption of another plan pursuant to section 1.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], has now circulated among the members of the full Judiciary Committee yet another revised draft. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the revised draft was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

SECTION 1. The people of a State may apportion one house of a bicameral legislature using population, geography, or political subdivisions as factors, giving each factor such weight as they deem appropriate, or giving similar weight to the same factors in apportioning a unicameral legislature, if, in either case, such plan of apportionment has been submitted to a vote of the people in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution and has been approved by a majority of those voting on that issue. When the first plan of apportionment is submitted to a vote of the people under this section there shall also be submitted, at the same election, an alternative plan of apportionment based upon substantial equality of population.

SEC. 2. Any plan of apportionment which has been approved under this article shall be resubmitted to a vote of the people, or, another plan may be submitted under the provisions of section 1, at the November general election held two years following each year in which there is commenced any enumeration provided for in section 2 of article I, and upon approval by a majority of those voting thereon, such plan of apportionment shall continue in effect until changed in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, these three official drafts are only a small portion of the total number of drafts, redrafts, and reredrafts which have been shown to and discussed with interested members of the Judiciary Committee.

I recognize, Mr. President, that the purpose of holding hearings on any bill is to obtain expert and responsible opinion. The purpose of committee executive sessions is to refine and revise bills to meet criticism and objections. Many of the changes that Senator DIRKSEN has made reflect the points that were made in the hearings and by other Senators. Certainly some changes reflect a healthy response to criticism.

The newspapers report, and I have no reason to disagree, that the Judiciary Committee is almost evenly divided on this issue. The reports are that eight members favor an amendment, seven are opposed, and one is undecided. Since nine votes are required to report a bill, assuming the entire membership to be present, the question arises whether recent changes reflect the weight of reasonable criticism at the hearings or the present thinking of the membership of the committee.

I do not criticize compromise. Certainly the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution No. 2 have every right to make such changes as they deem necessary to report an amendment. In a normal bill this is a wholly routine procedure and is to be respected and even applauded.

But this is not a routine bill. This is a constitutional amendment. It is not even a routine constitutional amendment upon which most elements of the society agree. This amendment is hotly disputed. It will undoubtedly work the most far-reaching changes in our Federal system since the 14th amendment was adopted in 1868. This amendment would be the first amendment since the found-

ing of the Republic which would limit the franchise of citizens of the United States.

I do not believe we should effect such far-reaching changes in our system of Government, without full and fair consideration. I do not think we should make fundamental changes in the basic law of our land without adequate hearings. I do not believe that we should be placed in a position to be criticized about the manner in which we draft amendments to the Constitution.

Let there be no mistake. The latest draft of the Dirksen amendment bears little relation to the amendment reported by the subcommittee and even less resemblance to Senate Joint Resolution 2, upon which hearings were held.

The subcommittee made two significant changes in the original text of Senate Joint Resolution 2.

First, it eliminated the opening sentence, which was widely interpreted as denying judicial review.

Second, it included a complex provision for periodic resubmission of any plan previously adopted by referendum.

Senator DIRKSEN has now proposed, without further hearings or subcommittee consideration, additional and substantial changes. These include:

First. The factors other than population that can be considered are now limited to geography and political subdivisions.

Second. These two factors can be accorded such weight as (the people) deem appropriate in both a bicameral and unicameral legislature. The earlier texts both limited the use of nonpopulation factors in apportioning a unicameral legislature to reasonable weight.

Third. The provision for periodic resubmission has been wholly rewritten.

Fourth. The new draft requires that the first malapportionment plan shall be submitted to the people, along with an alternative plan based upon substantial equality of population.

My point is that this is virtually a new amendment. It bears only faint resemblance to Senate Joint Resolution 2, on which hearings were held in the Senate. I submit that, before this new language is considered on the floor of the Senate, further hearings should be held. We need to know what the lawyers, the scholars, the political scientists of this country think about this new language. We need to hear from mayors, Governors, and local political leaders as to what effects the new language can be expected to have.

There are many serious questions to be considered and answered. A few come very quickly to mind.

First. What is "geography" as a factor in apportioning a State legislature? Can a State give greater weight to mountaineers than fishermen? Can it give more seats to deserts than to areas of greater population? Can it give one mountainous area more representation than another mountainous area? Or must it be consistent in applying a geographic factor?

Second. What are "political subdivisions"?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I read recently that the State of Hawaii is interested in acquiring Samoa and Guam as a part of that State. What would be the point of geography in that case?

Mr. TYDINGS. The point made by the Senator from Tennessee is well taken. Can a State legislature make a new town, draw new lines for its sewerage or sanitary districts and then claim to have changed "geography" or to have created a "political subdivision"?

What, I repeat, is a "political subdivision"? Is an unincorporated town or a school district or a sewerage district a "political subdivision"? Is there anything to prevent a State from changing its subdivision boundaries to effect unequal representation?

If, as the Senator from Tennessee suggests, Hawaii annexed Guam, would Guam be a "political subdivision"?

Does this amendment, as now written, overrule the Supreme Court's decision in *Gomillion* against Lightfoot? Can a State or county gerrymander to exclude from a "political subdivision" Negroes, Jews, migratory workers, or any other group?

Third. Why did the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 2 remove the "reasonable weight" limit as applied to unicameral State legislatures? Under the new, proposed Dirksen amendment, the third draft we have seen, can a State with a single house, a unicameral system, completely ignore population? Is this not an open invitation in some States to change from a bicameral to a unicameral system, in order to be able to malapportion the State legislature?

Fourth. If it makes sense to submit, along with a malapportionment plan, an alternative plan based upon substantial equality of population, why is this requirement limited to the first time a plan is presented? If that is fair one time, it should be fair every time.

Such questions were never discussed in our hearings, but now the distinguished Senator's greatly changed amendment is being circulated to members of the Judiciary Committee. Committee members are expected to vote on the first amendment to limit the franchise since the signing of the Declaration of Independence without benefit of mature deliberation on its current provisions.

My point is that we should not amend the Constitution of the United States in panic or in haste. If the distinguished minority leader has new and better language to propose, it should be taken back to the subcommittee, and hearings should be held on the language. These hearings could be limited in scope to the changes which the Senator has proposed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. This Congress has already submitted to the States one ambiguously drafted constitutional amendment. I hope it will not hastily submit another questionable provision.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. I would dislike for the RECORD to go unchallenged by not inserting the opinion that, though the Senator from Indiana has the greatest respect for his colleague, the Senator from Tennessee, he is still resolute in his disagreement with the Senator from Tennessee regarding the interpretation to be placed on the constitutional amendment which I hope soon will be the 25th amendment, and which has already been ratified by three States, that of the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Nebraska, and the Senator from Wisconsin. It is only the beginning of what we hope will be a long list of State legislatures that do not share the opinion of the Senator from Tennessee. I know reasonable men can disagree, but I feel sure in this instance I am correct.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CASE. In line with the difference as between the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Indiana on the amendment which was adopted a few days ago, I am sure there is no disagreement in this particular matter between the two Senators on this point, and that is on the position of the Senator from Maryland when he urges that the language which has never been considered by committee, offered as a substitute, I am sure in the best of faith, should nevertheless be given the same scrutiny as the original resolution, because nobody is good enough to make language, and no combination of people is good enough to present language, which has not been scrutinized in the committee, and this applies most particularly to an amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator makes the very point I was trying to make. There is no question of the good faith of the distinguished minority leader. Of course not. The point is that in the final draft which he has circulated to members of the Judiciary Committee, he has come up with substitute language for the original Senate Joint Resolution 2, on which hearings were held. He has drafted new language which would permit the legislatures to apportion on factors other than population, but permitting consideration only of geography and political subdivisions. These are extremely broad areas. Their definition requires further study and consideration. It was not before the subcommittee. Occasionally, a question may have been asked in the general area, but the subject was not adequately covered. It was not adequately covered because it is contained in a draft which is entirely different from the resolution on which the subcommittee worked for months, a draft which incorporates basic changes never considered by the subcommittee. I submit that we should not adopt a constitutional amendment, nor ask the people to ratify it, when it is presented in a changed form which has never been adequately considered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. With further reference to the proposed constitutional amendment previously referred to, let the RECORD show that a goodly number of questions have now been asked about it, and some persons are having second thoughts about it. But it is too late. It has been submitted to the States. From the volumes of editorials written across the country, one would gather that serious questions are being entertained about the meaning of the proposed amendment and the advisability of its being ratified.

Let the RECORD show that while three States have ratified, one has declined to ratify. Apart from that fact, it is a mistake we have already made. There was a time when we could have corrected it. The purpose of the Senator from Tennessee was to have the proposal returned to the committee for some study and drafting because the Senate had adopted language to be submitted to the States as a constitutional amendment which had not been considered carefully—indeed, language on which members of the conferees differed in their interpretations as to meaning.

I plead with the Senate Judiciary Committee not to repeat this kind of mistake. This is a precious document with which we are dealing. If we make a mistake and enact a statute, it can be repealed, but stripping something from the Constitution of the United States is quite a different thing. It is a more serious matter with which we deal. I hope that before the Senate Judiciary Committee reports another amendment to the Constitution, it will hold hearings on the exact text upon which the Senate is expected to act.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I dislike to shoot dead soldiers and debate an issue which has already been decided on the floor of the Senate. We are doing a disservice to the decision which has already been made by both Houses of Congress—by the votes which have already been cast by an overwhelming majority of the Senate—to cast reflections now upon the decision which was made.

The Senator from Tennessee is rendering a creditable service to the overall discussion of this matter by clarifying—if, indeed, clarification was necessary—what the legislative intent would be.

I do not like to see an issue discussed again which has already been decided by the Senate.

I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator from Tennessee that the Judiciary Committee and all other committees of Congress should give the closest consideration to a matter as important as a constitutional amendment.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I intend to follow this pattern to the last degree.

I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Maryland in yielding to me.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Barlett, one of its read-

ing clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7984) to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PATMAN, Mr. MULTER, Mr. BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. FINO, and Mrs. DWYER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 24) to expand, extend, and accelerate the saline water conversion program conducted by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. ROGERS of Texas, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. REINECKE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had concurred in the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 through 36, inclusive, and in amendments numbered 42 and 43 to the bill (H.R. 8775) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate numbered 37 through 41, inclusive, and 44 through 49, inclusive, to the bill; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Mr. STEED, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. SLACK, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. MAHON, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. REIFEL, and Mr. JONAS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

COLD WAR VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTANA in the chair). The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise today to address the Senate in support of Senate bill 9, the cold war GI bill. I was privileged to have sponsored this very necessary and worthwhile legislation on the day it was first introduced in the 89th Congress, January 6, 1965. Not only did I enthusiastically support Senator YARBOROUGH, the distinguished author of this bill, but I also appeared in support of it before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs on February 19, 1965.

I feel especially qualified to sponsor the proposed legislation and vote for its passage today, for I was a beneficiary of one

of the previous GI bills. It gave me an opportunity to continue my education following my term of service during the Korean conflict, and enabled me to avoid the unhappy choice between foregoing further education or delaying it still longer in an effort to acquire the resources to gain it.

The same problems of readjustment and economic dislocation that we knew 10 years ago are faced today by thousands of young men returning from service in the Armed Forces. These young Americans have been forced to disrupt their lives and careers to serve in the Armed Forces throughout the world. Then, after completion of their term of service, these men face not only the serious problems of adapting back to civilian life, but also find themselves far, far behind those in their age group who were allowed to continue their schooling and their careers.

Thus, the cold war GI bill has been proposed to balance this situation and to give the veteran who has sacrificed 2, 3, or 4 years of his life an opportunity to catch up with his nonveteran companions whose lives were not disrupted by military service.

One of the main arguments against the bill has been that since the United States is officially at peace, it would be unprecedented and unwarranted to give peacetime servicemen benefits previously extended only to those who faced the hazards of war. However, the distinction as to whether the United States is officially at peace is a meaningless technicality when American servicemen are being killed and wounded in Vietnam and elsewhere. In addition, neither the World War II nor the Korean GI bills made any distinction between those who served in the front lines and those who served in a safe stateside job. The two previous GI bills were not intended as reward for combat duty, and applied to all veterans. Their main purpose was to help veterans readjust to civilian life and catch up to those whose lives were not disrupted by military service. This is also the purpose of the cold war GI bill.

In addition to the matter of fairness to cold war servicemen, the cold war GI bill would also serve the national interest as did the World War II and Korean GI bills.

It has been well established that the Nation reaped tremendous social and economic values from the two previous GI bills, mainly as a result of the educational assistance they provided.

More than 7,800,000 World War II veterans—nearly half of the 16,500,000 U.S. participants—took some form of training under the GI bill.

Of the total enrolled 2,200,000 attended colleges and universities; 3,500,000 went to schools below college level; 1,400,000 underwent on-the-job training; and 700,000 underwent on-the-farm training.

Today we are a far stronger Nation because of the infusion of skilled and professional manpower gained through the GI bill; 450,000 engineers, 180,000 doctors, dentists, nurses, 360,000 school-

teachers, 150,000 scientists, 107,000 lawyers, 243,000 accountants, 36,000 clergymen of all faiths, 17,000 writers and journalists, 711,000 mechanics, 383,000 construction workers, 288,000 metalworkers, 138,000 electricians, 83,000 policemen and firemen, 61,000 printers and typesetters, and 70,000 who trained for business and executive careers.

The total cost of the program was \$14.5 billion. Eighty percent of this went directly to the veterans in the form of subsistence allowances. Nearly all the rest was spent on tuition and other training costs and only 5 cents out of every dollar went for administration.

Experts have stated that our present shortages in these and other essential occupations would have been even more critical—perhaps catastrophic—had it not been for the GI bills.

In Minnesota, nearly 200,000 veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict were able to upgrade their education and training as a result of the GI bills. The cold war GI bill would provide the same educational opportunities to about 34,000 more Minnesota veterans during the first 5 years of its operation.

Finally, it has been shown that GI bills are really an investment which eventually pay for themselves. U.S. Census Bureau figures show that World War II veterans alone now pay the Federal Government \$1 billion a year in additional taxes because of the increased earning power they attained from their GI schooling.

Altogether, it was the largest program of mass adult education ever undertaken at bargain rates. The \$14.5 billion cost has been more than recouped.

The GI bill continues to pay for itself at close to \$1 billion a year. The return comes from additional income tax paid by better educated, higher earning GI bill veterans. I am pleased to add my support to the proposed legislation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am grateful for the kind remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. More than that, I am grateful for his support to the 5 million cold war GI veterans. What is important is the right of those young men to go to school, and not be cast among the unemployed. As the letter from the Department of Education of California indicates, 5 percent of the young men in this age bracket are unemployed. Unemployment among veterans in this age bracket, however, is 10 percent. Since the veterans are also included in the 5 percent, it can be readily seen that the percentage of the unemployed among the veterans is well over two times that of nonveterans. The nonveterans have been able to remain at home and go to school, while the veterans, after serving an average of 28 months, come back unprepared for civilian life and walk the streets and remain unemployed. It is a great injustice, and it is a situation which has been created by our Government.

I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for recognizing the situation and speaking out in an effort to correct it.

PROPOSED ANNEXATION BY U.S. OF PACIFIC TRUST TERRITORY

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I rise to speak in behalf of the cold war GI bill. Before doing so, I should like to refer briefly to the topic which was touched upon by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, when he asked the Senator from Maryland what would happen if Hawaii were to annex Saipan and Guam, for example.

I say to the Senator from Tennessee that at the present time a discussion is underway in the Pacific on the possibility or feasibility of Hawaii annexing the trust territory islands.

At the present time the first congress of Micronesia is being held at Saipan. Thirty-three delegates from the trust territory are taking part in the first meeting, and they are exploring the feasibility of setting up self-government for those islands in the Pacific.

There are a number of islands in this area which extend a distance almost equal to the distance across continental United States. The area has a population of approximately 87,000. It covers a vast territory in the Pacific.

These islands are under a United Nations trusteeship, and the United States is administering the islands.

Great concern has been expressed as to what will happen in the future to those islands. It has been suggested that they be annexed by the State of Hawaii. If that should happen, with apologies to the junior Senator from Alaska, it would make Hawaii the largest State in the Union, even larger than Alaska.

About 3 years ago the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] talked with me about the possibility of Hawaii annexing those islands, so that they could become a part of the United States. The islands are now under United Nations trusteeship. Before they could be annexed by the United States and added to the State of Hawaii, we would naturally have to obtain the consent of the United Nations and also the consent of the people who live on the islands.

This topic is being discussed in the Pacific. It is a live topic. There are many pros and cons on the subject. I believe we should give serious thought to the future of those islands.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am very happy that this extremely important subject has come up in the Senate. It is true, as the senior Senator from Hawaii has pointed out, that this idea came to me some years ago. I proposed and discussed the idea with the late Oren Long, of Hawaii, 4 years ago and with Senator Fong and Senator Inouye and with Governor Burns of Hawaii. It seems to me that one of the problems that we as a democracy face is the desire not to have colonies and to act in accordance with such purpose. Colonies are not appropriate to our system of government. Yet with respect to certain areas under our flag, if we could achieve that ideal objective, it would be to give them all the full equality of statehood, just as has now been achieved by the State so

ably represented by the Senator from Hawaii and also by my own State. That was the latest action in the validation of our basic principles, by establishing full equality for the Americans of Alaska and of Hawaii. By that action in the 85th and 86th Congresses, we extended the frontiers of democracy to America's farthest north, farthest south, farthest west, and farthest east. It is not generally known that Alaska is not only the farthest north and the farthest west, but also the farthest east extension of the United States, for Alaska extends into the Eastern Hemisphere.

The question naturally comes up with respect to the smaller entities in the Pacific, whose economy and small population would not justify statehood, such as Samoa, Guam, Wake and the multiple islands of the Trust Territories. Yet we must find a practical way of ending their colonial status. Any changes, however, should of course take into consideration the best interests of all the parties concerned. It would seem not impossible to conceive that in the years to come we would ultimately create a great Pacific State, always assuming that the various components themselves desired it as well as the great State of Hawaii, to which the proposal is to annex them at the appropriate time and after full understanding and consent will have been obtained. I remember when we discussed the admission of the State of Hawaii to the Union in the Senate, those who opposed such action raised the objection that the proposed State was separated from the continent of the United States by vast international waters, that it was way out in the Pacific, and that international waters separated Hawaii's various islands. That was raised as an insuperable objection to the admission of Hawaii to statehood. Yet that was not found to be a valid objection. It is no more valid in connection with the whole Pacific area, and the proposed Pacific State, in these days of radio communication, jet transportation and what will, before long, be transportation at supersonic speeds. It is just as conceivable as it now has become in the case of Hawaii, that this vast area will one day be one State with persons living in it sharing equal citizenship with the citizens of our country. What could be a more desirable or more glorious destiny for them?

Therefore, I believe it is very fortunate indeed that this subject has come up for discussion. This proposal will not happen immediately, if it happens at all. Certainly it is a subject that requires discussion, study, and a good deal of thought.

This objective should, of course, not be attempted or achieved without the consent of the various component parts, first the State of Hawaii and the people of Hawaii, and also the people of these various other Pacific areas.

Some of them may not wish to join; some may. It is an extremely important subject. The future of these areas is a matter of our concern and of our responsibility. I am very much gratified the distinguished Senator from Hawaii has

brought this up. It is something that we may look forward to. I know from personal contact that the people in these various areas would not desire to achieve anything other than American citizenship. At the present time they have a second-class affiliation and political status. Their hope, I am confident, would be for achieving first-class American citizenship, but that would have to be officially ascertained.

I know of no better way than by this proposal.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska. This is a very exciting idea. It first came from the distinguished Senator from Alaska. I compliment him for bringing forth this great idea.

As a Senator from the State of Hawaii I welcome the idea. I have been working toward the idea of having Hawaii annex those territories which would like to join us, with the consent of the United Nations.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it was my privilege last December to be in the western Pacific. Members of Congress were in the party, including Representative MATSUNAGA, of Hawaii. We were astonished by the number of Hawaiians among those who came out to see the delegation from the Congress.

In Kwajalein, among the American civilian employees there we found many Hawaiians.

I pay tribute to the people of the State of Hawaii, the State so ably represented by Senator Fong, for their western movement.

Our history is characterized by the western movement of our people. In Alaska, for example, we are referred to as the "South 48."

We were amazed when we from the so-called South 48, reached the western Pacific, to find a large number of Hawaiians who had gone to the smaller islands.

A great number of American citizens from Hawaii have gone to the smaller island in the trust territories. They have created a great deal of good will for all the people of the United States, and they have rendered a unique service for the people of this country.

What we are discussing today is a fine idea, and I pay tribute to all the people of Hawaii for having pioneered as teachers, as farmworkers, and as helpers. Hawaiians are making a unique contribution as Americans to the democratic idea and American liberties. They are carrying democratic principles and ideals of liberty and of freedom forward throughout that vast area.

In another territory, which is recognized as being a part of Japan, Okinawa, there are many Americans from Hawaii.

It will be remembered that when Okinawa was a part of Japan it was considered the poorest prefecture of Japan. Now it has an average standard of living comparing favorably with that of the other prefectures in Japan.

American citizens have done much toward bringing this about, and many of

such American citizens come from Hawaii.

I congratulate the Senator and his State and the people of his State on their pioneering spirit.

Mr. FONG. I thank the Senator from Texas for his laudatory and commendatory remarks concerning the contribution of the people of Hawaii in the Pacific Basin.

Just prior to the convening of the Congress of Micronesia, Hawaii sent a delegation to advise, counsel, and help the delegates on how to draft a bill, for example, to hold committee meetings, and other procedures related to our democratic form of government. Many of our people have gone to various parts of the trust territory and to the Orient, especially those who have been connected with the East-West Center.

We have sent quite a number of teams to the various countries in the South Pacific and to Asia. They have done and are doing fine work. The people of Hawaii and the United States should promote this idea and should not be afraid to expand their assistance. They should not be afraid to meet new problems. They should not be afraid to accept new people. That is the way we grow and prosper and that is the way we help others to grow and prosper.

I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a postscript?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I can think of no more ideal circumstances, apart from the compelling geographical aspects, than to have the State of Hawaii father and guide the exploration of this far-reaching project, because Hawaii has presented to the United States long before its admission to statehood, a shining example of ethnic democracy. Indeed the finest under our flag. In my judgment, one of the strongest reasons why Hawaii should have been admitted to statehood long before it was is not merely because of its right to the full equality of statehood and all the other reasons for ending its territorial status, but because it shows the United States, as I have said, an exemplification of racial democracy, of the meeting and mingling of the races of East and West, an entity in which there was less racial prejudice and less discrimination than anywhere else in America, setting the finest example to the rest of the Nation and to the world. For that reason, with the diversity of races in the Pacific, Hawaii offers the ideal location and the most qualified people to father the project, explore it, and see whether or not it may be feasible. The State of Hawaii has already rendered a great contribution to the United States. It has set an example of tolerance for the rest of the States to emulate.

Mr. FONG. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska. I am contemplating offering a resolution in the Senate to obtain the consensus of the Congress in order to determine whether the idea is feasible. If the Congress looks favorably on the idea, I should like then to have the people of Hawaii and the people of the trust territory vote on it and

see whether they are favorable to the idea. If they are, we should then present a petition to the United Nations to see whether the United Nations would allow the people of the South Pacific to join the people of Hawaii and this great Nation.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. The project need not be consummated in toto all at once. It might be that some islands out there would like to join, and the State of Hawaii would like to have them join. It would not be necessary to consummate the entire project at one time. In all likelihood, if the idea is deemed feasible, it is something that may be achieved step by step. Certain areas will not be ready for it as soon as others, assuming we could get the consent of the United Nations. There are five or six ethnic groups in the trust territories. They represent different stages of development. I believe that we need not feel that the idea must be accepted in toto immediately, or indeed at any one time. I congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii on his proposal to submit a resolution which would enable us to explore the subject much more fully.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I agree heartily with the distinguished Senator from Alaska that the idea may not be consummated quickly, but we should be working at it promptly, because it is a great idea. It will take time, and I know it will require a great deal of effort. I hope that when I submit the resolution, I shall have the cooperation and support of the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. When that takes place, Alaska might be willing to yield its title as the largest State remembering that even with the proposed Pacific State extending over a larger area, Alaska will still have a larger land mass, because a great deal of the area within the Pacific State would be Pacific Ocean and international domain.

Mr. FONG. I thank the Senator for his generosity.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have found the discussion most interesting and enlightening. I introduced the subject in debate today, not to express approval or disapproval of the suggestion, for I have not studied it sufficiently to reach such a conclusion. My first impression is that the State of Hawaii might very well offer administrative and other advantages to the people of Samoa and Guam, islands of considerable population, which those people do not now enjoy. I am not sure that the same would hold true of the smaller islands of Micronesia, but I shall await the Senator's resolution and am prepared to consider that on its merits.

I raised the point neither to criticize nor to commend. I would be inclined to commend all those who advocate consideration of the question, as I now commend the senior Senator from Hawaii. I raised the question because it has a

pertinent bearing on a proposed constitutional amendment on which the Judiciary Committee of this body is about to act. The new version of the Dirksen amendment refers to geography as a means of determining representation. Should Hawaii adopt Kwajalein as a part of her State, would a person living on Kwajalein have more proportionate representation than a citizen living in Honolulu? Would it mean that an Aleut on the extremity of the Aleutians could, under the U.S. Constitution or under the proposed amendment to it, have representation disproportionate to citizens living in Nome, Alaska?

I do not know the answers to those questions, but I say to my able friend the senior Senator from Hawaii that I recently made one mistake with regard to a proposed constitutional amendment. I waited too late to give it the study to which it was entitled, and I waited too late effectively to raise fundamental questions.

Since I referred earlier today, within the hour, to the proposed 25th amendment, another Senator approached me on the floor of the Senate, and said that were the vote to be taken again he would change his position. He has had second thoughts. I would not like to have disturbing second thoughts about still another constitutional amendment proposed and submitted to the States by Congress. I raised this point in respect to the proposal to annex Micronesia, Samoa, Guam, and Saipan into the State of Hawaii as a means of questioning the advisability of the Judiciary Committee's reporting to the Senate a proposed amendment to the Constitution, on the text of which there has been no public hearing.

Mr. FONG. I understand that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee did not intend to discuss the merits of this subject. The only reason for his proposing the matter was in connection with the Dirksen amendment. Although I do not see eye to eye with the distinguished Senator from Maryland, nevertheless, his statement that we should look very deeply into the question of reapportionment merits consideration.

COLD WAR VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the measure, I gave my wholehearted support to the cold war veterans GI bill.

It was my privilege to cosponsor the predecessor bill, S. 5, of the last Congress, which was reported favorably to the Senate in July 1963. I deeply regret that the 88th Congress, which compiled an excellent record of enactment in the field of education, did not enact S. 5.

I am delighted that S. 9 has been called up for Senate consideration so soon in this session of Congress.

I hope the Senate will approve this legislation, which is so long overdue.

Before proceeding with my statement, I should like to pay tribute to the senior Senator from Texas, who beginning with the 86th Congress has steadfastly and tirelessly led the struggle for enactment of this vital program.

I commend him for his foresight, for his faith, and for his perseverance.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FONG. I am glad to yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii for his kind remarks and for his staunch support as a coauthor of the measure. I ask him the following question: Is it not a fact that in World War II service in Hawaii was considered overseas service?

Mr. FONG. It was.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. At the present time service in Hawaii is not considered service overseas, so people who served in the war, even though sent from the mainland in World War II, were considered overseas service veterans and received pay and allowance as overseas veterans. But under suggestions made, that is no longer overseas territory, and, under some amendments that I have heard discussed, Hawaiians and Alaskans would have special disability that they did not suffer in World War II.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Hawaii for his leadership in this matter.

Mr. FONG. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas.

I should like to add that I, too, am more convinced than ever of the great need for, and the great value of, this program.

COLD WAR SERVICE

Since the Korean armistice was signed July 27, 1953, our country has been technically at peace, a peace so hazardous and uncertain that it is called the cold war.

American GI's serve all over the globe—in the frigid Arctic, in the steaming jungles of Vietnam, elsewhere in Asia, at the wall in Berlin, in the Dominican Republic, on the seven seas, and in the air.

Our cold war GI's are the Minute Men of our times, on the alert to protect our Nation and to fulfill America's worldwide commitment to peace.

Those who conclude their service in this capacity should be aided in readjusting to civilian life, so that they may qualify for jobs, pursue their vocations, and support their families.

As the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] pointed out last January, 44 percent of the draft-eligible young men serve in the Armed Forces, sacrificing 2 to 4 years of their lives at a crucial age.

Meantime, the other 56 percent of their contemporaries are using this period to further their education and careers. Our Nation should recognize the disadvantage suffered by the 44 percent who serve in uniform. We should help them get over the hump as they return to civilian life to begin a career or to resume a career interrupted.

Senate bill 9 will do this by providing educational assistance and home and farm loan assistance for some 5 million veterans of the cold war.

S. 9 OPPONENTS MISTAKEN

There are some who oppose S. 9 under the mistaken impression that the benefits provided for so-called peacetime veterans are what were provided to veterans of World War II and the Korean war.

The bill, however, recognizes that Congress traditionally has made a distinction between wartime service and peacetime service in providing veterans' programs.

This is why S. 9 doubles the number of active-duty days of service to 180 days as a minimum. World War II and Korean war veterans were permitted GI bill benefits after only 90 days of active duty service.

This is why S. 9 does not contain any mustering-out payments to cold war veterans.

This is why S. 9 does not provide a program of business and insured loans as were provided for veterans of World War II and the Korean war.

Under S. 9, loans for cold war veterans could only be made or guaranteed for their homes or their farms. Moreover, under S. 9 cold war veterans would be required to pay a loan guarantee fee of one-half of 1 percent of the amount of the loan.

This fee was not required of World War II and Korean war veterans. Under those programs, the Federal Government pays the losses. But under S. 9, cold war veterans themselves would in effect be paying for any losses under the home and farm loan program.

AREA-OF-HOSTILITY AMENDMENT TOO RESTRICTIVE

There are some who contend that the education and training benefits of S. 9 and the home and loan assistance should be available only to those who serve in "areas of hostility."

I do not believe it should be confined only to such veterans. The World War II GI bill and the Korean war GI bill were not confined only to those who served in areas of hostility. We know there were many people in these wars who did not serve in actual combat. Some never served outside continental United States. Yet we did not deny them the GI benefits.

The fact is that military personnel go where they are commanded to go. They serve where they are ordered to serve.

I do not believe we should exclude those who do not serve in areas of hostility—for this is a matter beyond their control.

Earlier this year, I joined a number of Senators in legislation which confined these benefits to those serving in areas of hostility. I did so because I recognized the administration is opposed to granting GI bill benefits to all veterans of the cold war, even those who have served as long as 180 days.

I did so because I wanted to serve notice to the administration that the senior Senator from Hawaii believes the

very least we should do is to grant educational assistance and home and farm loans for cold war veterans in areas of hostilities, such as Vietnam.

Of the two proposals, however, I believe S. 9 is far preferable. Therefore, I am against the amendment to limit benefits only to those who serve in areas of hostilities.

I shall vote for S. 9, which does not make service in an area of hostility a requirement for eligibility for GI assistance.

I concur in the reasoning of the majority of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which stated in their report:

The proposal * * * to limit eligibility under this bill to those veterans who have served in "areas of hostilities" as designated by the President was rejected for several reasons.

In the first place, the philosophy and purpose of the GI bills is and has been to give readjustment assistance to the veteran returning to civilian life after substantial military service and not to reward him for the risk that he might have been exposed to.

Secondly, most servicemen are not able to choose the area in which they serve. If this proposal were adopted, one would have in effect the paradoxical situation in which a serviceman could obtain readjustment benefits only when the foreign policy of the United States failed to maintain the peace.

There is even a serious question whether many of the cold war hot spots could be designated as an "area of hostilities," since the U.S. troops are often present in advisory capacities. A Presidential declaration of such a situation as an "area of hostilities" would be an admission of U.S. active military participation in the conflict and would be contrary to the foreign policy of the United States.

Having a choice between S. 9, which would include all cold war veterans with 180 days or more of active duty service, and the amendment, which would limit education and home and farm loan benefits to those who serve in areas of hostilities, I shall vote for S. 9.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS SHOULD NOT BE LOANS

There are some who contend the educational, vocational, and farm training benefits of S. 9 should be put on a loan basis, rather than a grant basis.

I cannot go along with this.

GI benefits for World War II veterans and Korean war veterans were not made on a loan basis. They were outright monthly grants. There is no reason why GI benefits for cold war veterans should be extended on a loan basis.

Indeed, there are additional reasons why these should be grants.

As the committee report on S. 9 points out:

The allowances recommended by this bill, in terms of actual value, are roughly equal to 70 percent of an identical allowance paid in 1952.

The report further states:

The post-Korean veteran will pay a much greater proportion of his education allowance for tuition than was the case with a similarly circumstanced Korean veteran enrolled in school in 1952. The post-Korean veteran, according to a research paper prepared by the Library of Congress, can be expected to pay over 50 percent of his educational allow-

ance for tuition as contrasted to 28 percent of an identical amount paid by the Korean veteran in 1952.

The cost of living has gone up since the World War II and Korean war GI programs, which means the cold war veterans' monthly allowance under S. 9 will not stretch as far as the same allowance did even for the Korean war veteran. And the cost of education has gone up, so that the cold war GI will have to pay a greater portion of his allowance for tuition, leaving less for his subsistence.

As the committee report pointed out:

The majority of veterans attending school under this bill will have to supplement the educational grant with part-time employment and in many cases the wives of these veterans will also have to work to help pay for their husband's training.

It is estimated that the \$110 monthly allowance to a Korean war veteran would have to be raised to \$153.68 a month to provide equivalent buying power. Put another way, \$110 today will buy only as much as \$72 would buy in 1952.

So it is clear that the grants allowed under S. 9 are not the equivalent of grants allowed World War II and Korean war veterans. This is another argument against making cold war GI's repay their educational assistance.

There are other arguments against GI loans for schooling. It will certainly discourage a great many GI's from furthering their education. Seventy percent of veterans have had only some high school training or have completed high school but have no further training. It is doubtful large numbers of them will want to go into debt to undertake college education, and even more doubtful that they would want to go into debt to train in courses below college level.

To put this program on a loan basis will greatly restrict veteran participation in the educational, vocational, and job training benefits of S. 9.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. MURPHY in the chair). The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, if the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts does not prevail, I intend to offer an amendment which would adopt the same scale of benefits proposed by S. 9 but would substitute a system of assistance loans in place of grants.

The argument which has been made by those who have spoken on behalf of S. 9 is that the grants furnished under S. 9 would serve the purpose of readjustment, by providing educational benefits.

Mr. FONG. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. It would not be a bonus.

Mr. FONG. It would not be a bonus.

Mr. COOPER. The bill does not contemplate a bonus.

Mr. FONG. There is no mustering-out pay.

Mr. COOPER. As you have mentioned loans, I shall explain why I intend to pro-

pose assistance loans rather than assistance grants.

It is my view that assistance loans would attract those who really desire educational adjustment. It would not attract those who are not interested in education.

That is the basic difference in the philosophical approach of my proposed amendment and S. 9 as reported by the committee.

I served on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in 1959 when the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] sponsored the bill. I pay him tribute for his persistence. However, we split in the committee as between loans and grants. The argument still goes on.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the split in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is not so marked now as it was in 1959. Then the bill passed the Veterans Subcommittee by a majority of 3 to 2. It passed the full committee by a majority of 8 to 7.

In the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs every vote was in favor of this bill, Democratic and Republican. The measure passed the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by a majority of more than 2 to 1. This year, we had a bigger majority for the bill than we have ever had.

The distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii supported this bill and cosponsored the measure. He has voted consistently for veterans on this and other measures.

There will not be any boondoggling under this measure. Under the cold war GI bill of World War II, of 16 million veterans, only 7,800,000 veterans took advantage of the educational provisions of the bill. That would be about 48.5 or 49 percent.

The World War II veterans' bill was far more generous. The Korean veterans were closer to college age than had been the veterans of World War II. When we had 16 million men under arms in World War II, we scraped the manpower barrel. In the Korean conflict, there were 4,750,000 men. However, since benefits were not as generous as they had previously been, only 45 percent of the veterans of the Korean conflict were able to go to school. Eighty percent of those veterans had to borrow money, or they or their wives worked.

Nobody will go to school under this measure for the purpose of getting something free. They must put in their own time or work. One hundred and ten dollars a month will purchase now, as can be seen in the Record, as much as \$72 would purchase in 1952. That concerns the articles that a student must buy.

In 1952, the Korean veterans could take \$72 of their allowance and purchase as much in the way of education as \$110 a month would purchase now.

With this restriction, nobody predicts that as many as 45 percent of these veterans will go to school now. The provisions are too hard and restricted.

I wish that there were an allowance for this increase in living cost. However, as a practical matter, we have made it the same as it was in the case of the Korean conflict. We have retained the same dollar limitation. However, this measure would not admit as many veterans to college because the enrollment, tuition, and matriculation costs in American colleges has doubled in private colleges since 1952. It has also doubled in the public and State tax-supported colleges. The private college enrollment and tuition costs are much higher than those of the public tax-supported colleges. Even at their low level, the costs in public tax-supported colleges have doubled since 1952. It is far more difficult for a veteran to go to school on this limited allowance now than it was back in 1952.

It would be impossible under this limited allowance for somebody to go to school without some other source of funds. Furthermore, if the veteran does not pass his courses, he must leave. He would be cut off. The Veterans' Administration maintains a record. A veteran could not boondoggle under this measure.

If the veteran did not pass his courses, his allowance would stop. Under the bill, records would be kept by the Veterans' Administration. There would be an exchange of records between the colleges and the Veterans' Administration. If the veteran flunked his courses, the Veterans' Administration would be notified, and the veteran would be through. The veteran would have to maintain his grades. Under the previous programs, we have found that the veterans have higher grades than the nonveterans.

The college administrators tell us that the veterans are the most dedicated and devoted of all the students. They must be in order to remain there.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Hawaii for his leadership. I thank him for his recognition of the fact that the men now serve and are disadvantaged for 28 months. In the case of the veterans of the Korean conflict, it was 21½ or 22 months.

This is a readjustment bill, as the Senator from Hawaii has so ably pointed out. There would be no mustering-out pay, no bonus, such as there was in the GI bill in World War II.

In this measure, the title is explanatory. It is a readjustment bill and not a bonus bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I want at this time to make clear the difference between the two proposals—the one for grants, and my proposal for loans.

I may say to the Senator from Hawaii and the Senator from Texas that I believe we agree that the men who are serving today an average of 28 months, as the Senator has said, have lost certain educational opportunities in the service. I will not say that their time has been lost because certain great advantages come from serving one's country. But accepting the premise that 28 months have

been lost as far as educational and employment opportunities are concerned and that those who have served in the armed service have been placed at a disadvantage in comparison with those who have not served. I believe we are agreed on the second point, that there should be some plan of readjustment. We agree too that education and training benefits are the best means toward readjustment.

On these points we are agreed, but here is the difference. I believe that a generous loan program will offer them great opportunities for education and for training. I believe it would serve the best purposes, because it would be accepted by those who seriously seek education and training.

In my judgment, we will be in the cold war for years to come, and many in our Nation will be serving their country under trying circumstances. So we must seek to establish a program that will be certain to meet these special needs that these veterans will have, with assurance that a growing number will be able to take advantage of it, no matter what other programs might be adopted and funded to meet general needs.

Mr. FONG. Every American owes a duty to serve his country, but we as Members of Congress know that there is a corresponding responsibility on our part to take care of them. Congress has not differentiated between veterans of World War II and veterans of the Korean conflict. We did not make those benefits loans. We made them grants. There is no reason why we should not give to veterans of the cold war grants instead of loans.

The arguments made by the senior Senator from Texas have been quite convincing. He has answered most adequately the arguments presented by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

To continue with my statement, educators who appeared in behalf of S. 9 during the subcommittee hearings on this bill testified that a loan program would not accomplish what needs to be accomplished by a cold war GI bill.

GI BILL PAYS FOR ITSELF

Experience under the World War II and Korean war GI bills is that these bills do pay back their costs.

The Veterans' Administration in a statement on the 20th anniversary of the World War II GI bill said:

The better educated, higher earning veterans are returning higher taxes to the U.S. coffers at a rate expected to pay back the entire amount twice and possibly thrice over in the course of a lifetime.

Veterans' Administrator John S. Gleason, Jr., wrote in an article last year:

The \$14.5 billion cost has been more than recouped. * * * The GI bill continues to pay for itself at close to \$1 billion a year. The return comes from additional income tax paid by better educated, higher earning GI bill veterans.

I believe experience under the cold war GI bill would parallel experience under the World War II bill.

There is no need to require cold war GI's to repay their educational allowances. These costs will be repaid in due

time by means of the higher income taxes the GI's will pay as their training qualifies them for higher paying jobs.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING UNDER S. 9

S. 9 provides that cold war veterans honorably discharged after 180 or more days of military service or because of service-connected disability would receive 1½ days of educational assistance for each day of active duty service between January 31, 1955—when Korean war GI aid expired—to July 1, 1967—when the draft law expires.

Up to 36 months of schooling would be allowed, the same period allowed under the Korean GI bill.

Veterans must begin their education or training within 3 years after their separation from service and complete it within 8 years after separation or the enactment of this bill. No allowance would be paid for any period of educational training before September 1, 1965.

Eligible veterans may use their allowances for—

First. School courses, both at college and below college level full time, three-fourths time, one-half time, or less than one-half time.

Second. Cooperative courses, combining school and on-the-job training in alternating cycles, on a full-time basis only.

Third. Correspondence courses and flight training.

Fourth. On-the-job training on a full-time basis only.

Fifth. Institutional on-farm training on a full-time basis only.

ALLOWANCES UNDER S. 9

A monthly cash allowance would be made to eligible veterans to apply toward tuition and expenses at the school of his choice. A single veteran enrolled full time would receive \$110 monthly; a married veteran with one dependent, \$135 monthly; with more than one dependent, a maximum of \$160 a month.

Part-time students would receive proportionately less.

Veterans pursuing full-time educational courses with some on-job training included would receive \$90 if single, \$110 per month if he has one dependent; and up to \$130 a month if more than one dependent.

For veterans receiving apprentice or other on-job training, S. 9 provides \$70 monthly if single, on up to \$105 if there is more than one dependent. This education and training allowance would be reduced every 4 months under a formula as his work program progresses. Combined GI education allowances and on-job pay could not exceed \$310 a month.

On-farm training allowances would range from \$95 monthly for single veterans to \$130 a month for veterans with more than one dependent. Like on-job allowances, farm training allowances would be progressively reduced as the trainee neared completion of his training.

LOANS UNDER S. 9

S. 9 also provides for direct and Government-guaranteed loans to eligible cold war veterans for buying homes, including farm homes, and for farm lands and livestock to be used by them in farming op-

erations. Again, 180 days of active-duty service are required for eligibility.

This loan program would pay for itself, through repayments on loans and through a small fee—one-half of 1 percent—on the loans to cover any losses. Experience has shown that losses have been less than 1 percent under previous programs.

It is expected some 1 million veterans will be able to purchase homes and farms under this section, of which some 700,000 may be new construction.

The widow of a veteran who died of service-connected disability also is eligible.

Banks or other lenders can make loans with the Government guaranteeing 60 percent, up to \$7,500 on residential real estate, and 50 percent, up to \$4,000, on nonresidential real estate. Direct loans not exceeding \$13,500 may be made to veterans in certain small towns and rural areas when private capital is not available to guarantee loans.

SUMMARY

In summary, this is the situation.

Because of the cold war, our Nation has had to maintain sizable defense forces in Army, Navy, Marines, and the Air Force.

To make sure our Armed Forces have sufficient personnel, Congress has retained the Compulsory Military Training Act.

Actual hostilities in Korea ceased July 27, 1953. Yet the draft law has been on the books ever since and is still effective through June 30, 1967.

Thousands of young Americans are required by the compulsory draft law to serve on active duty in the Armed Forces for a specific period of time.

Following their active duty, which may take them to far distant areas of the globe, these young people are further compelled to perform additional service in the Active Reserve and then they enter the Standby Reserve.

Once entered upon active duty, their total military obligation generally extends over a period of 6 years.

If it were not for the cold war, the majority of these young people would not enter military service. Most would remain in civilian life, pursuing their education, vocations, and careers.

COLD WAR VETS DENIED READJUSTMENT AIDS

As the committee stressed in the report on S. 9, the Federal Government does not offer these young citizens any assistance other than unemployment compensation in coping with the serious problems created by the cold war and their compulsory military service.

They are denied the readjustment aids so vitally needed to help them catch up with their contemporaries who did not have to serve but instead pursued their civilian lives.

PREVIOUS GI BILLS VERY SUCCESSFUL

After World War II and the Korean war, our Nation recognized the problems of readjustment facing veterans. Under the original GI bill and the Korean GI bill, nearly 11 million veterans received education and training which prepared them for employment.

In Hawaii, 17,000 World War II veterans out of 39,000 took GI bill training. Nearly 8,000 Korean war veterans out of 16,000 in Hawaii received educational benefits under the Korean GI bill.

There is no greater testimonial to the worth and value of this program both to the individual veterans and to the Nation as a whole than the outstanding success of these two GI bills.

Nearly 8 million veterans were educated under the World War II GI bill. They earn on the average \$2,000 to \$3,000 more a year than their nonveteran contemporaries. I do not have the figures for veterans trained under the Korean GI bill, but I am sure they would also average higher pay.

A veteran earning \$2,500 more a year than his nonveteran counterpart over a working lifetime—say 30 years—would earn a total of \$75,000 more than the average nonveteran.

In addition, the unemployment rate is much lower for veterans educated under the GI bill than for nonveterans of the same age group.

The picture is clear: Veterans educated under these GI bills are more likely to have jobs—at higher pay—and less likely to be unemployed than corresponding nonveterans.

Experience demonstrates GI bill veterans are better off.

Experience also demonstrates the Nation is better off. Because of the World War II and Korean GI bills, our professional and technological resources have been vastly improved. We have 625,000 more engineers, 375,000 more teachers, 220,000 more medical and related personnel, and 165,000 more natural and physical scientists.

This is a priceless return on our Nation's investment in educational and other benefits for veterans.

It is by no means the only return. As I have already mentioned, according to the Internal Revenue Service, veterans who received World War II benefits have already paid back the total cost of the bill through taxes on the higher incomes they earn because of their GI bill training.

By 1970, both the World War II and Korean GI bills will have more than paid the costs.

There is every reason to believe the cold war GI bill would pay for itself, too.

I am confident S. 9 will yield more than enough in the future to pay the costs of the program.

S. 9 is designed to increase the employability of millions of cold war veterans, to give them an opportunity to obtain education and training in civilian fields and to give them an opportunity to buy their homes.

Based on previous GI bill experience, out of an estimated 6,260,000 cold war veterans through fiscal year 1977, about 1,500,000 could be expected to take advantage of GI bill training, including an estimated 6,000 in Hawaii.

The basic purpose of this legislation is in accord with our Nation's drive against poverty.

It is in accord with our Nation's drive to expand educational opportunities for Americans.

It is a program following a format that has been tried and proven successful.

It is a program that will yield quick and substantial returns—both to the cold war veterans and to the progress and well-being of America.

I strongly urge enactment of S. 9 as a vital and necessary cold war measure. Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

Mr. FONG. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I congratulate and commend the Senator from Hawaii on his remarks, and express my warmest appreciation to him for his cogent and forcible stand so much needed in support of the bill, which he has cosponsored along with 40 other Senators, both Democratic and Republican.

In my opinion, the Senator from Hawaii has presented a strong case for the bill, and has demonstrated that it should not be crippled by devastating amendments which would tear the heart out of the bill.

I commend the able Senator for his fine leadership on behalf of the veterans of America.

Mr. FONG. I thank the Senator from Texas for his kind remarks.

REMARKABLE ECONOMIC PROGRESS OF REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, on June 30 this year, the Republic of China completed an impressive chapter in its economic success story. On that day President Chiang Kai-shek's Government joined the ranks of nations which graduated themselves out of the class of recipients of U.S. economic assistance.

For 16 years the Republic of China had received our country's help through the AID programs, while struggling for survival and stability on Taiwan. For 16 years the Republic of China had steadily changed Taiwan from an underdeveloped island into a thriving agricultural-industrial economy.

Today Taiwan stands as a shining example of a government and a people who won against overwhelming odds. Their economic victory is especially amazing because of the dire straits in which the free Chinese found themselves after evacuating to Taiwan from the Asian mainland. In that early period, some pessimists, watching from abroad, predicted the worst for the Nationalist Government. They concluded that Taiwan, in time, would either be absorbed by Red China or become a permanent and expensive ward of the United States. Neither has happened.

Instead, we find on Taiwan today a free people with a strong government, powerful military forces, and a vigorous, expanding economy. With America's help, the Republic of China has come a long, long way.

U.S. economic assistance to Taiwan amounted to \$1,425 million in the last 16 years. What the Nationalist Government and the people there have achieved with that aid is truly amazing.

The assistance helped to double the real income of the 12 million people now

living on Taiwan; increased the country's gross national product by almost 7 percent every year; boosted industrial production to an average rate of 12 percent a year, and agricultural production to almost 5 percent a year; helped to increase foreign investments to \$138.7 million, of which \$52.4 million came from the United States; and increased exports 140 percent in the decade between 1953 and 1963, giving China a favorable trade balance for the first time last year.

The land reform program has been notably successful in making available more lands to the farmers.

It has been my good fortune to have visited Taiwan on several occasions in recent years. On each visit, I was highly impressed with the vigor and industry of the people and their leaders. They displayed a commendable determination to overcome the difficulties they faced, and to work out their own solutions to the problems.

I had the opportunity on Taiwan to meet with President and Madame Chiang Kai-shek and the late Vice President Cheng Chen and to discuss at length with them many of their hopes and plans for the economic development of their people—plans which have materialized so successfully under their able and inspiring leadership.

Their courage was instilled into all segments of the population—within the government, among business and industrial leaders, in the academic circles, and among the general populace. The result has been the building of a viable, prosperous economy and the active participation of the people in their democratic government.

Now that American economic aid has ceased, the Republic of China is expected to seek needed capital through private conventional sources and also from the World Bank, the Export-Import Bank, and similar institutions in other developed countries. So Taiwan is now launched on a self-generating course of development, even though it will continue to receive military assistance and limited commitments under the food-for-peace program.

I salute President and Madame Chiang Kai-shek and the people of Taiwan for the remarkable economic development that has been achieved in just 16 years. They demonstrated what private enterprise, and imaginative government, hard work, ingenuity, planning, and judicious use of foreign aid can do for a developing country.

As reported by our Agency for International Development, these efforts have built roads, ports, power stations and strengthened or created a great variety of institutions that will continue to serve the people. With trained leadership and a firm capital base, Taiwan is prepared to make further progress on its own.

President and Madame Chiang Kai-shek and the people of the Republic of China have richly earned the general commendation that is being paid to them on the occasion of their economic independence. Theirs is an outstanding example of a modern economic miracle.

I wish to extend to them my sincere tribute and congratulations on having

succeeded so well in achieving self-support through self-help and our aid. I am confident that the energy, foresight, diligence, and skills which the free people of the Republic of China and their great enlightened leaders have demonstrated in such an exceptional manner on Taiwan so far will lead them to even greater progress and prosperity in the future.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

Mr. FONG. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I congratulate the Senator from Hawaii on his speech concerning the Republic of China. This is a subject which has been of great interest to me for a considerable period of time, and I wish to associate myself with his comments.

The other day, for a radio station in my own State, I did a small piece on the subject of the Republic of China, in which I noted that while their imports have doubled, their exports have tripled in the short space of 16 years. They have also developed from 7,000 industries to 25,000 industries, and their agricultural products have more than doubled. They have done a perfectly superb job of bringing their country into a position where it is a real, shining light in the hierarchy of southeast Asia.

The Republic of China has come under constant attack because it is still seated in the United Nations. Much debate has taken place on the floor of the Senate regarding the question of what to do with nations which are behind in their assessments to the United Nations.

The Republic of China is completely up to date in paying its regular assessments to the United Nations, based not only on the figure of the population of Taiwan, but also of the entire mainland of China. They are paying their dues for a total of 5 percent of the total United Nations regular budget.

It seems to me that this is a fantastic achievement for a developing country to be able to carry the burden of this kind of expense, by keeping it up to date and living within the obligations of the United Nations Charter.

I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. FONG. I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado for his kind remarks. The development of the Republic of China is, indeed, a fabulous story of a dynamic people. It is a miracle, indeed, to rise from what they were 16 years ago to the status of an economically independent nation today.

We are happy to congratulate the leadership and the people of the Republic of China for their very fine work.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

Mr. FONG. I am glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Permit me to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Hawaii on the 16th anniversary of the Republic of China on Taiwan.

The figures the Senator has given, and the remarks of the Senator from Colorado, cannot fail to impress us all re-

garding the fine achievement of the Republic of China during the past 16 years, under the great leadership of Chiang Kai-shek and the initiative of its citizens.

Madame Chiang Kai-shek was at Wellesley College for 4 years; and she is, therefore, almost a constituent of mine. For that reason, I have followed her career with a great deal of interest.

Mr. FONG. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his contribution to this colloquy. The people of Taiwan, President Chiang Kai-shek, and Madam Chiang Kai-shek will be most pleased with his remarks.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

Mr. FONG. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I commend the Senator from Hawaii for his very kind remarks.

One cannot help but feel impressed by the great advances that have been made economically in Taiwan. Separate and apart from advances by way of material development, I admire Chiang Kai-shek and his associates and the people of Taiwan primarily because of their great character and courage.

Quemoy and Matsu, the islands lying between the mainland of China and Taiwan, became a matter of great concern. Chiang Kai-shek knew that the islands would be bombed. However, he never flinched. The people of Taiwan remained stalwart, stood their ground, and defied the Communist Chinese on the mainland.

I assume that these attributes with respect to courage also reflect themselves in the development of the economy of these people. I have had faith in Chiang Kai-shek. I have had faith in the Taiwanese people. I believe that each passing year has demonstrated that the faith of the U.S. Government in those people has not been misplaced. They are a bulwark and a bastion in the cause of freedom in southeast Asia. I am glad to associate myself with what the distinguished Senator from Hawaii has said on the subject.

Mr. FONG. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am happy to associate myself with the remarks of the able Senator from Hawaii on the Republic of China. I had the pleasure, several years ago, of visiting Taiwan. I was deeply impressed with the outstanding leadership being provided the Republic of China by Chiang Kai-shek. I had the pleasure of talking with him and Madam Chiang Kai-shek. In my opinion they are two of the great world figures today.

Many are of the opinion that Chiang Kai-shek was forced to leave the mainland of China because of the failure of American policy. If we had stood by China under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek, freedom would prevail on the mainland today. I hope that it will not be too many years before Chiang Kai-shek will be back on the mainland. That is where he and all that he stands for belong.

I am proud that he has shown the great courage and foresight that he has in his

leadership of the Republic of China, although he has had many handicaps. It is my hope and prayer that the United States will stand solidly with the Republic of China. It is necessary that we do this in order to assure that freedom will prevail in that part of the world. The Republic of China stands shoulder to shoulder with the United States, and it will stand by its pledge to us. It is a pleasure for me to associate myself with the remarks of the able Senator and with the other statements that have been made today.

Mr. FONG. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his remarks. There is no question that we have a great ally in the Republic of China.

COLD WAR VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I offer, as an amendment and as a substitute for S. 9, a bill printed at page 17128 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD and shown as being sponsored by the Senators who sponsored S. 520.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The sponsors of the amendment are, besides myself, Senators ALLOTT, BENNETT, BOGGS, CARLSON, CASE, COOPER, COTTON, CURTIS, DIRKSEN, DOMINICK, FANNIN, FONG, HICKENLOOPER, HRUSKA, JAVITS, JORDAN of Idaho, KUCHEL, MILLER, MORTON, MUNDT, PEARSON, PROUTY, SCOTT, SIMPSON, THURMOND, TOWER, and YOUNG of North Dakota.

Mr. President, the only difference between the bill, S. 520, and the amendment as now offered is the printing at length in the bill, of the educational sections, which have become obsolete because the original educational sections of the GI bill expired on January 1, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof, in the nature of a substitute, the following: "That (a) paragraph (11) of section 101 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(11) The term 'period of war' means (A) the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, (B) the period beginning on the date of any future declaration of war by the Congress and ending on a date prescribed by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, and (C) any period of hostilities."

"(b) Section 101 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(29) The term 'area of hostilities' means any area designated by the President as an area of hostilities pursuant to the authority granted him under section 3111 of this title.

"(30) The term 'period of hostilities' means, with respect to any area of hostilities, the period of time during which such area has been designated an area of hostilities

pursuant to section 3111 of this title; but, for the purposes of this title, a veteran shall be considered to have served during a period of hostilities only if such veteran served at some time during such period in an area of hostilities, or if he suffered an injury or contracted a disease in line of duty or aggravated a preexisting injury suffered or disease contracted in line of duty while en route to or return from an area of hostilities.

"Sec. 2. (a) Section 521(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'or the Korean conflict,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Korean conflict, or a period of hostilities.'"

"(b) Section 521(g) of such title is amended by—

"(1) redesignating clauses (2), (3), and (4) as clauses (3), (4), and (5), respectively, and adding a new clause (2) after clause (1) as follows:

"(2) for a period of ninety consecutive days or more any part of which was served during a period of hostilities;"; and

"(2) by striking out 'or the Korean conflict,' in clause (3), as redesignated by this subsection, and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Korean conflict, or a period of hostilities.'"

"(c) The catchline of section 521 is amended to read as follows: 'Veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or a period of hostilities.'"

"(d) Section 541(a) of such title is amended by striking out 'or the Korean conflict' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Korean conflict, or a period of hostilities.'"

"(e) The catchline of section 541 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: ', and widows of veterans of a period of hostilities.'"

"(f) Section 542(a) of such title is amended by striking out 'or the Korean conflict' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Korean conflict, or a period of hostilities.'"

"(g) The catchline of section 542 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: ', and children of veterans of a period of hostilities.'"

"(h) the heading which precedes section 541 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"'WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, THE KOREAN CONFLICT, AND ANY PERIOD OF HOSTILITIES.'"

"(i) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 15 of such title is amended by—

"(1) striking out:

"'521. Veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict.'"

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'521. Veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or a period of hostilities.'"

"(2) striking out the heading which reads:

"'World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict'"

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"'World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, and any period of hostilities.'"

"(3) striking out:

"'541. Widows of World War I, World War II, or Korean conflict veterans.'"

"'542. Children of World War I, World War II, or Korean conflict veterans.'"

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"'541. Widows of World War I, World War II, or Korean conflict veterans, and widows of veterans of a period of hostilities.'"

"'542. Children of World War I, World War II, or Korean conflict veterans, and children of veterans of a period of hostilities.'"

"Sec. 3. Section 602 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by—

"(1) striking out 'World War II or of the Korean conflict' and inserting in lieu thereof 'World War II, the Korean conflict, or a period of hostilities'; and

"(2) inserting immediately before 'shall be deemed' the following: 'or within a period of two years following the last day of his service in an area of hostilities in the case of a veteran of a period of hostilities.'"

"Sec. 4. (a) Section 723(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'Any' at the beginning of such section and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'Any veteran of a period of hostilities shall, upon application in writing made within one hundred and twenty days after such veteran's discharge or release from the Armed Forces following his service in an area of hostilities and payment of premium as hereinafter provided, and without medical examination, be issued a policy of permanent plan life insurance or a policy of limited convertible five-year level premium term insurance under this subsection; and any'."

"(b) Section 723(b) of such title is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: 'Any veteran of a period of hostilities who was discharged or released from the Armed Forces prior to the date of enactment of this sentence shall, upon application made in writing within one hundred and twenty days after the date of enactment of this sentence and payment of premiums, and without medical examination, be issued insurance as provided in this subsection.'"

"Sec. 5. Section 1502(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'World War II or the Korean conflict' and inserting in lieu thereof 'World War II, the Korean conflict, or a period of hostilities.'"

"Sec. 6. (a) Title 38 of the United States Code is amended by adding after chapter 39 the following new chapter:

"'CHAPTER 40—EDUCATION OF VETERANS WHO SERVED BETWEEN JANUARY 31, 1955, AND JULY 1, 1967"

"'Subchapter I—Definitions

"'Sec.

"'1908. Definitions.

"'Subchapter II—Eligibility

"'1910. Entitlement to education or training generally.

"'1911. Duration of veteran's education or training.

"'1912. Commencement; time limitations.

"'1913. Expiration of all education and training.

"'Subchapter III—Enrollment

"'1920. Selection of program.

"'1921. Applications; approval.

"'1922. Change of program.

"'1923. Disapproval of enrollment in certain courses.

"'1924. Discontinuance of unsatisfactory progress.

"'1925. Period of operation for approval.

"'1926. Institutions listed by Attorney General.

"'Subchapter IV—Payments to veterans

"'1931. Education and training allowance.

"'1932. Computation of education and training allowances.

"'1933. Measurement of courses.

"'1934. Overcharges by educational institutions.

"'Subchapter V—State approving agencies

"'1941. Designation.

"'1942. Approval of courses.

"'1943. Cooperation.

"'1944. Use of Office of Education and other Federal agencies.

"'1945. Reimbursement of expenses.

"'Subchapter VI—Approval of courses of education and training

"'1951. Apprentice or other training on the job.

"'1952. Institutional on-farm training.

"'1953. Approval of accredited courses.

"'1954. Approval of nonaccredited courses.

"'1955. Notice of approval of courses.

"'1956. Disapproval of courses and discontinuance of allowances.

"'Subchapter VII—Miscellaneous provisions

"'Sec.

"'1961. Authority and duties of Administrator.

"'1962. Educational and vocational counseling.

"'1963. Control by agencies of United States.

"'1964. Conflicting interests.

"'1965. Reports by institutions.

"'1966. Overpayments to veterans.

"'1967. Examination of records.

"'1968. False or misleading statements.

"'1969. Information furnished by Federal Trade Commission.

"'1970. Effective date and retroactive allowances.

"'Subchapter I—Definitions

"'§ 1908. Definitions

"'(a) For the purpose of this chapter—

"'(1) The term "basic service period" means the period commencing with the veteran's most recent entry, enlistment, or call to active duty prior to his service in an area of hostilities and ending on the date of his first discharge or release from active duty after his service in such area.

"'(2) The term "eligible veteran" means any veteran who is not on active duty and who—

"'(A) served on active duty at any time during a period of hostilities;

"'(B) was discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable; and

"'(C) served on active duty for a period of more than ninety days (exclusive of any period he was assigned by the Armed Forces to a civilian institution for a course of education or training which was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians, or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies), or was discharged or released from a period of active duty, any part of which occurred during a period of hostilities, for an actual service-connected disability.

"'(3) The term "program of education or training" means any single unit course or subject, any curriculum, or any combination of unit courses or subjects, which is generally accepted as necessary to fulfill requirements for the attainment of a predetermined and identified educational, professional, or vocational objective.

"'(4) The term "course" means an organized unit of subject matter in which instruction is offered within a given period of time or which covers a specific amount of related subject matter for which credit toward graduation or certification is usually given.

"'(5) The term "dependent" means—

"'(A) a child of an eligible veteran;

"'(B) a parent of an eligible veteran, if the parent is in fact dependent upon the veteran; and

"'(C) the wife of an eligible veteran, or, in the case of an eligible veteran who is a woman, her husband if he is in fact dependent upon her.

"'(6) The term "educational institution" means any public or private elementary school, secondary school, vocational school, correspondence school, business school, junior college, teachers college, college, normal school, professional school, university, scientific or technical institution, or other institution furnishing education for adults.

"'(7) The term "training establishment" means any business or other establishment providing apprentice or other training on the job, including those under the supervision

of a college or university or any State department of education, or any State apprenticeship agency, or any State board of vocational education, or any joint apprentice committee, or the Bureau of Apprenticeship established in accordance with chapter 4C of title 29, or any agency of the Federal Government authorized to supervise such training.

"(8) The term "State" includes the Canal Zone.

"(9) The term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education.

"(b) Benefits shall not be afforded under this chapter to any individual on account of service as a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, or of the Regular or Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service.

"(c) The Congress of the United States hereby declares that the veterans' education and training program created by this chapter is for the purpose of providing vocational readjustment and restoring lost educational opportunities to those service men and women whose educational or vocational ambitions have been interrupted or impeded by reason of active duty during a period of hostilities and for the purpose of aiding such persons in attaining the educational and training status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained had they not served their country.

"Subchapter II—Eligibility

"§ 1910. Entitlement to education or training generally

"Each eligible veteran shall, subject to the provisions of this chapter, be entitled to the education or training provided under this chapter.

"§ 1911. Duration of veteran's education or training

"(a) Each eligible veteran shall be entitled to education or training under this chapter for a period equal to one and a half times the duration of his service on active duty during his basic service period (or to the equivalent thereof in part-time training), except that—

"(1) in computing the duration of such service, there shall be excluded a period equal to any period he was assigned by the Armed Forces to a civilian institution for a course of education or training which was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians or served as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies;

"(2) the period of education or training to which an eligible veteran shall be entitled under this chapter shall not, except as provided in subsection (b), exceed thirty-six months reduced by a period equivalent to any period of educational assistance afforded him under chapter 35 of this title; and

"(3) the period of education or training to which an eligible veteran shall be entitled under this chapter together with vocational rehabilitation training received under chapter 31 of this title, and education or training received by virtue of his service during the Korean conflict or under part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1(a), and section 12(a) of the Act enacting this title shall not, except as provided in subsection (b), exceed thirty-six months in the aggregate.

"(b) Whenever the period of entitlement to education or training under this chapter of an eligible veteran who is enrolled in an educational institution regularly operated on the quarter or semester system ends during a quarter or semester and after a major part of such semester or quarter has expired, such period shall be extended to the termination of such unexpired quarter or semester. In all other courses offered by educational institutions, whenever the period of eligibility ends after a major portion of the course is completed such period may be extended to the end of the course or for nine weeks, whichever is the lesser period.

"(c) In the case of any eligible veteran who is pursuing any program of education or training exclusively by correspondence, one-fourth of the elapsed time in following such program of education or training shall be charged against the veteran's period of entitlement.

"§ 1912. Commencement; time limitations

"(a) No eligible veteran shall be entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter after three years after his discharge or release from active duty or after three years after the date of enactment of this chapter, whichever is later. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, any otherwise eligible veteran whom the Administrator determines to have been prevented from initiating a program of education or training under this chapter within the period prescribed by the preceding sentence because he had not met the nature of discharge requirements of section 1908(a)(1) (B) of this title before a change, correction, or modification of a discharge or dismissal made pursuant to section 1553 of title 10, the correction of the military records of the proper service department under section 1552 of title 10, or other corrective action by competent authority, shall be permitted to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter within three years after the date of his discharge or dismissal was so changed, corrected, or modified, or within three years after the date of enactment of this chapter, whichever is later.

"(b) The program of education and training of an eligible veteran under this chapter shall, on and after the delimiting date for the veterans to initiate his program, be pursued continuously until completion, except that an eligible veteran may suspend the pursuit of his program for periods of not more than twelve consecutive months, and may suspend the pursuit of each program for longer periods if the Administrator finds that the suspension of each such period was due to conditions beyond the control of the eligible veteran.

"(c) For the purposes of computing the three-year period under this section and the eight-year period under section 1913, the date of an eligible veteran's discharge or release shall be the date of his discharge or release from his last period of active duty which began before his service in an area of hostilities.

"§ 1913. Expiration of all education and training

"No education or training shall be afforded an eligible veteran under this chapter beyond eight years after his discharge or release from active duty or eight years after the enactment of this chapter, whichever is later, except that any veteran who is eligible to initiate a program of education or training by reason of the second sentence of section 1912(a) of this title shall be permitted to pursue, subject to the other provisions of this chapter, such program for a period of not more than five years after the date of initiation thereof; but in no event shall education or training be afforded under this chapter after June 30, 1972.

"Subchapter III—Enrollment

"§ 1920. Selection of program

"Subject to the provisions of this chapter, each eligible veteran may select a program of education or training to assist him in attaining an educational, professional, or vocational objective at any educational institution or training establishment selected by him, whether or not located in the State in which he resides, which will accept and retain him as a student or trainee in any field or branch of knowledge which such institution or establishment finds him qualified to undertake or pursue. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, an eligible veteran may not pursue a program of education or training at an educational in-

stitution or training establishment which is not located in a State, unless such program is pursued at an approved educational institution of higher learning. The Administrator in his discretion may deny or discontinue the enrollment under this chapter of any veteran in a foreign educational institution if he finds that such enrollment is not for the best interest of the veteran or the Government.

"§ 1921. Applications; approval

"Any eligible veteran who desires to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter shall submit an application to the Administrator which shall be in such form, and contain such information, as the Administrator shall prescribe. The Administrator shall approve such application unless he finds that such veteran is not eligible for or entitled to the education or training applied for or that his program of education or training fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter, or that the eligible veteran is already qualified, by reason of previous education and training, for the educational, professional, or vocational objective for which the courses of the program of education or training are offered. The Administrator shall notify the eligible veteran of the approval or disapproval of his application.

"§ 1922. Change of program

"(a) Subject to the provisions of section 1921 of this title, each eligible veteran (except an eligible veteran whose program has been interrupted or discontinued due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application) may, at any time before the end of the period during which he is entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter, make not more than one change of program of education or training.

"(b) Each eligible veteran, who has not made a change of program of education or training before the expiration of the period during which he is entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter, may make not more than one change of program of education or training with the approval of the Administrator. The Administrator shall approve such a change if he finds that—

"(1) the eligible veteran is not making satisfactory progress in his present program and that the failure is not due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application, and if the program, to which the eligible veteran desires to change is more in keeping with his aptitude or previous education and training; or

"(2) the program to which the eligible veteran desires to change, while not a part of the program currently pursued by him, is a normal progression from such program.

"(c) As used in this section the term "change of program of education or training" shall not be deemed to include a change from the pursuit of one program to pursuit of another where the first program is prerequisite to, or generally required for, entrance into pursuit of the second.

"§ 1923. Disapproval of enrollment in certain courses

"(a) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran in any bartending course, dancing course, or personality development course.

"(b) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran—

"(1) in any photography course or entertainment course; or

"(2) in any music course—instrumental or vocal—public speaking course, or course in sports or athletics such as horseback riding, swimming, fishing, skiing, golf, baseball, tennis, bowling, sports officiating, or other sport or athletic courses, except courses of applied music, physical education, or public speaking which are offered by institutions of

higher learning for credit as an integral part of a program leading to an educational objective; or

"(3) in any other type of course which the Administrator finds to be avocational or recreational in character;

unless the eligible veteran submits justification showing that the course will be of bona fide use in the pursuit of his present or contemplated business or occupation.

"(c) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of any eligible veteran, not already enrolled, in any nonaccredited course below the college level offered by a proprietary profit or proprietary nonprofit educational institution for any period during which the Administrator finds that more than 85 percentum of the students enrolled in the course are having all or any part of their tuition, fees, or other charges paid to or for them by the educational institution or the Veterans' Administration under this chapter, chapter 31 of this title, or section 12(a) of the Act enacting this title.

"§ 1924. Discontinuance for unsatisfactory progress

"The Administrator shall discontinue the education and training allowance of an eligible veteran of, at any time, he finds that, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the educational institution or training establishment, the conduct or progress of such veteran is unsatisfactory.

"§ 1925. Period of operation for approval

"(a) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran in any course offered by an educational institution when such course has been in operation for less than two years.

"(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to—
"(1) any course to be pursued in a public or other tax-supported educational institution;

"(2) any course which is offered by an educational institution which has been in operation for more than two years, if such course is similar in character to the instruction previously given by such institution;

"(3) any course which has been offered by an institution for a period of more than two years, notwithstanding the institution has moved to another location within the same general locality; or

"(4) any course which is offered by a nonprofit educational institution of college level and which is recognized for credit toward a standard college degree.

"§ 1926. Institutions listed by Attorney General.

"The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of, or payment of an education and training allowance to, any eligible veteran in any course in an educational institution or training establishment while it is listed by the Attorney General under section 3 of part III of Executive Order 9835, as amended.

"Subchapter IV—Payments to Veterans

"§ 1931. Education and training allowance

"(a) The Administrator shall pay to each eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training under this chapter, and who applies therefor, an education and training allowance to meet in part the expenses of his subsistence, tuition, fees, supplies, books, and equipment.

"(b) The education and training allowance for an eligible veteran shall be paid, as provided in section 1932 of this title, only for the period of the veterans' enrollment as approved by the Administrator, but no allowance shall be paid—

"(1) to any veteran enrolled in an institutional course which leads to a standard college degree or a course of institutional on-farm training for any period, when the veteran is not pursuing his course in accordance with the regularly established policies and regulations of the institution and the requirements of this chapter;

"(2) to any veteran enrolled in an institutional course which does not lead to a standard college degree or in a course of apprenticeship or other training on the job for any day of absence in excess of thirty days in a twelve-month period, not counting as absences weekends or legal holidays established by Federal or State law during which the institution or establishment is not regularly in session or operation; or

"(3) to any veteran pursuing his program of education exclusively by correspondence for any period during which no lessons were serviced by the institution.

"(c) No education and training allowance shall be paid to an eligible veteran for any period until the Administrator shall have received—

"(1) from the eligible veteran (A) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in an institutional course which leads to a standard college degree or a course of institutional on-farm training, a certification that he was actually enrolled in and pursuing the course as approved by the Administrator, or (B) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in an institutional course which does not lead to a standard college degree or a course of apprenticeship or other training on the job, a certification as to actual attendance during such period, or (C) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in a program of education or training by correspondence, a certification as to the number of lessons actually completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution; and

"(2) from the educational institution or training establishment, a certification, or an endorsement on the veteran's certificate, that such veteran was enrolled in and pursuing a course of education or training during such period, and, in the case of an institution furnishing education or training to a veteran exclusively by correspondence, a certification, or an endorsement on the veteran's certificate, as to the number of lessons completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution. Education and training allowances shall, insofar as practicable, be paid within twenty days after receipt by the Administrator of the certifications required by this subsection.

"§ 1932. Computation of education and training allowances

"(a) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training in an educational institution and is not entitled to receive an education and training allowance under subsection (b), (c), (d), (e), or (f) shall be computed as follows:

"(1) If such program is pursued on a full-time basis, such allowance shall be computed at the rate of \$110 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of \$135 per month, if he has one dependent, or at the rate of \$160 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(2) If such program is pursued on a three-quarters time basis, such allowance shall be computed at the rate of \$80 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of \$100 per month, if he has one dependent, or at the rate of \$120 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(3) If such program is pursued on a half-time basis, such allowance shall be computed at the rate of \$50 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of \$60 per month, if he has one dependent, or at the rate of \$80 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(b) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a full-time program of education and training which consists of institutional courses and on-the-job training, with the on-the-job training portion of the program being strictly supplemental to the institutional portion, shall be computed at the rate of (1) \$90 per month, if he has no dependent, or

(2) \$110 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) \$130 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(c) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing apprenticeship or other training on the job shall be computed at the rate of (1) \$70 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) \$85 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) \$105 per month, if he has more than one dependent; except that his education and training allowance shall be reduced at the end of each four-month period as his program progresses by an amount which bears the same ratio to the basic education and training allowance as four months bears to the total duration of his apprenticeship or other training on the job; but in no case shall the Administrator pay an education and training allowance under this subsection in an amount which, when added to the compensation to be paid to the veteran, in accordance with his approved training program, for productive labor performed as a part of his course, would exceed the rate of \$310 per month. For the purpose of computing allowances under this subsection, the duration of the training of an eligible veteran shall be the period specified in the approved application as the period during which he may receive an education and training allowance for such training, plus such additional period, if any, as is necessary to make the number of months of such training a multiple of four.

"(d) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing institutional on-farm training shall be computed at the rate of (1) \$95 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) \$110 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) \$130 per month, if he has more than one dependent; except that his education and training allowance shall be reduced at the end of the third, and each subsequent, four-month period as his program progresses by an amount which bears the same ratio to \$65 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or \$80 per month, if he has one dependent, or \$100 per month, if he has more than one dependent, as four months bears to the total duration of such veteran's institutional on-farm training reduced by eight months. For the purpose of computing allowances under this subsection, the duration of the training of an eligible veteran shall be the period specified in the approved application as the period during which he may receive an education and training allowance for such training, plus such additional period, if any, as is necessary to make the number of such months of such training a multiple of four.

"(e) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing a program of education or training exclusively by correspondence shall be computed on the basis of the established charges which the institution requires nonveterans to pay for the course or courses pursued by the eligible veteran. Such allowance shall be paid quarterly on a pro rata basis for the lessons completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution, as certified by the institution.

"(f) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training under this chapter in an educational institution on a less than half-time basis shall be computed at the rate of (1) the established charges for tuition and fees which the institution requires similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same course to pay, or (2) \$110 per month for a full-time course, whichever is the lesser.

"(g) Each eligible veteran who is pursuing an approved course of flight training shall be paid an education and training allowance to be computed at the rate of 75 per centum of the established charge which similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same flight course are required to pay

for tuition for the course. If such veteran's program of education or training consists exclusively of flight training, he shall not be paid an education and training allowance under one of the preceding subsections of this section; if his program of education or training consists of flight training and other education or training, the allowance payable under this subsection shall be in addition to any education and training allowance payable to him under one of the preceding subsections of this section for education or training other than flight training. Such allowance shall be paid monthly upon receipt of certification from the eligible veteran and the institution as to the actual flight training received by the veteran. In each such case the eligible veteran's period of entitlement shall be charged (in addition to any charge made against his entitlement by reason of education or training other than flight training) with one day of each \$1.25 which is paid to the veteran as an education and training allowance for such course.

"(h) No eligible veteran shall be paid an education and training allowance under this chapter for any period during which (1) he is enrolled in and pursuing a course of education or training paid for by the United States under any provision of law other than this chapter, where the payment of such allowance would constitute a duplication of benefits paid to the veteran from the Federal Treasury, or (2) he is pursuing a course of apprenticeship or other training on the job, a course of institutional on-farm training, or a course of education and training described in subsection (b) on a less than full-time basis.

"§ 1933. Measurement of courses

"(a) For the purposes of this chapter (1) an institutional trade or technical course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level involving shop practice as an integral part thereof, shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of thirty hours per week of attendance is required with not more than two and one-half hours of rest periods per week allowed, (2) an institutional course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level in which theoretical or classroom instruction predominates shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of twenty-five hours per week net of instruction is required, and (3) an institutional undergraduate course offered by a college or university on a quarter or semester-hour basis for which credit is granted toward a standard college degree shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of fourteen semester hours or its equivalent is required.

"(b) The Administrator shall define full-time training in the case of all types of courses of education or training other than institutional on-farm training and the types of courses referred to in subsection (a); except that, the Administrator shall not define full-time apprentice training for a particular establishment other than that established as the standard workweek through bona fide collective bargaining between employers and employees.

"§ 1934. Overcharges by educational institutions

"The Administrator may, if he finds that an institution has charged or received from any eligible veteran any amount in excess of the established charges for tuition and fees which the institution requires similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same course to pay, disapprove such educational institution for the enrollment of any veteran not already enrolled therein, except that, in the case of a tax-supported public educational institution which does not have established charges for tuition and fees which it requires nonveteran residents to pay, such institution may charge and receive from each eligible veteran who is a

resident an amount equal to the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction attributable to such veteran, but in no event to exceed the rate of \$10 per month for a full-time course. Any educational institution or training establishment disapproved under this section shall also be disapproved for the enrollment of any veteran not already enrolled therein under chapter 31, or for the enrollment of any eligible person not already enrolled therein under chapter 35.

"Subchapter V—State Approving Agencies

"§ 1941. Designation

"(a) Unless otherwise established by the law of the State concerned, the chief executive of each State is requested to create or designate a State department or agency as the "State approving agency" for his State for the purposes of this chapter.

"(b) (1) If any State fails or declines to create or designate a State approving agency, the provisions of this chapter which refer to the State approving agency shall, with respect to such State, be deemed to refer to the Administrator.

"(2) In the case of courses subject to approval by the Administrator under section 1942 of this title, the provisions of this chapter which refer to a State approving agency shall be deemed to refer to the Administrator.

"§ 1942. Approval of courses

"(a) An eligible veteran shall receive the benefits of this chapter while enrolled in a course of education or training offered by an educational institution or training establishment only if such course is approved by the State approving agency for the State where such educational institution or training establishment is situated or by the Administrator. Approval of courses by State approving agencies shall be in accordance with the provisions of this chapter and such other regulations and policies as the State approving agency may adopt. Each State approving agency shall furnish the Administrator with a current list of educational institutions and training establishments, specifying courses which it has approved, and, in addition to such list, it shall furnish such other information to the Administrator as it and the Administrator may determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter. Each state approving agency shall notify the Administrator of the disapproval of any course previously approved and shall set forth the reasons for such disapproval.

"(b) The Administrator shall be responsible for the approval of courses of education or training offered by any agency of the Federal Government authorized under other laws to supervise such education or training. The Administrator may approve any course in any other educational institution or training establishment in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

"§ 1943. Cooperation

"(a) The Administrator and each State approving agency shall take cognizance of the fact that definite duties, functions, and responsibilities are conferred upon the Administrator and each State approving agency under the veterans' educational programs. To assure that such programs are effectively and efficiently administered, the cooperation of the Administrator and the State approving agencies is essential. It is necessary to establish an exchange of information pertaining to activities of educational institutions and training establishments, and particular attention should be given to the enforcement of approval standards, enforcement of wage and income limitations, enforcement of enrollment restrictions, and fraudulent and other criminal activities on the part of persons connected with educational institutions and training establishments in which veterans are enrolled under this chapter.

"(b) The Administrator will furnish the State approving agencies with copies of such Veterans' Administration informational material as may aid them in carrying out this chapter.

"§ 1944. Use of Office of Education and other Federal agencies.

"(a) In carrying out his functions under this chapter, the Administrator may utilize the facilities and services of any other Federal department or agency. The Administrator shall utilize the services of the Office of Education in developing cooperative agreements between the Administrator and State and local agencies relating to the approval of courses of education or training as provided for in section 1945 of this title, in reviewing the plan of operations of State approving agencies under such agreements, and in rendering technical assistance to such State and local agencies in developing and improving policies, standards, and legislation in connection with their duties under this chapter.

"(b) Any such utilization shall be pursuant to proper agreement with the Federal department or agency concerned; and payment to cover the cost thereof shall (except in the case of the Office of Education) be made either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be provided in such agreement. Funds necessary to enable the Office of Education to carry out its functions under this chapter are authorized to be appropriated directly to such Office.

"§ 1945. Reimbursement of expenses

"The Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts or agreements with State and local agencies to pay such State and local agencies for reasonable and necessary expenses of salary and travel incurred by employees of such agencies in (1) rendering necessary services in ascertaining the qualifications of educational institutions and training establishments for furnishing courses of education or training to eligible veterans under this chapter, and in the supervision of such educational institutions and training establishments, and (2) furnishing, at the request of the Administrator, any other services in connection with this chapter. Each such contract or agreement shall be conditioned upon compliance with the standards and provisions of this chapter.

"Subchapter VI—Approval of Courses of Education and Training

"§ 1951. Apprentice or other training on the job

"(a) Apprentice or other training on the job shall consist of courses offered by training establishments whenever such courses of training are furnished in accordance with the provisions of this section. Any training establishment desiring to furnish a course of apprentice or other training on the job shall submit to the appropriate State approving agency a written application setting forth the course of training for each job for which an eligible veteran is to be trained. The written application covering the course of training shall include the following:

"(1) Title and description of the specific job objective for which the eligible veteran is to be trained;

"(2) The length of the training period;

"(3) A schedule listing various operations for major kinds of work or tasks to be learned and showing for each, job operations or work, tasks to be performed, and the approximate length of time to be spent on each operation or task;

"(4) The wage or salary to be paid at the beginning of the course of training, at each successive step in the course, and at the completion of training;

"(5) The entrance wage or salary paid by the establishment to employees already trained in the kind of work for which the veteran is to be trained; and

"(6) The number of hours of supplemental related instruction required.

"(b) The appropriate State approving agency may approve a course of apprentice or other training on the job specified in an application submitted by a training establishment in accordance with subsection (a) if such training establishment is found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

"(1) The training content of the course is adequate to qualify the eligible veteran for appointment to the job for which he is to be trained.

"(2) There is reasonable certainty that the job for which the eligible veteran is to be trained will be available to him at the end of the training period.

"(3) The job is one in which progression and appointment to the next higher classification are based upon skills learned through organized training on the job and not on such factors as length of service and normal turnover.

"(4) The wages to be paid the eligible veteran for each successive period of training are not less than those customarily paid in the training establishment and in the community to a learner in the same job who is not a veteran.

"(5) The job customarily requires a period of training of not less than three months and not more than two years of full-time training, except that this provision shall not apply to apprentice training.

"(6) The length of the training period is no longer than that customarily requested by the training establishment and other training establishments in the community to provide an eligible veteran with the required skills, arrange for the acquiring of job knowledge, technical information, and other facts which the eligible veteran will need to learn in order to become competent on the job for which he is being trained.

"(7) Provision is made for related instruction for the individual eligible veteran who may need it.

"(8) There is in the training establishment adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide satisfactory training on the job.

"(9) Adequate records are kept to show the progress made by each eligible veteran toward his job objective.

"(10) Appropriate credit is given the eligible veteran for previous training and job experience, whether in the military service or elsewhere, his beginning wage adjusted to the level to which such credit advances him, and his training period shortened, accordingly, and provision is made for certification by the training establishment that such credit has been granted and the beginning wage adjusted accordingly. No course of training will be considered bona fide if given to an eligible veteran who is already qualified by training and experience for the job objective.

"(11) A signed copy of the training agreement for each eligible veteran, including the training program and wage scale as approved by the State approving agency, is provided to the veteran and to the Administrator and the State approving agency by the employer.

"(12) Upon completion of the course of training furnished by the training establishment the eligible veteran is given a certificate by the employer indicating the length and type of training provided and that the eligible veteran has completed the course of training on the job satisfactorily.

"(13) That the course meets such other criteria as may be established by the State approving agency.

"§ 1952. Institutional on-farm training

"(a) An eligible veteran shall be entitled to the benefits of this chapter while enrolled in a course of full-time institutional on-farm training which has been approved by the

appropriate State approving agency in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(b) The State approving agency may approve a course of institutional on-farm training when it satisfies the following requirements:

"(1) The course combines organized group instruction in agricultural and related subjects of at least two hundred hours per year (and of at least eight hours each month) at an educational institution, with supervised work experience on a farm or other agricultural establishment.

"(2) The eligible veteran will perform a part of such course on a farm or other agricultural establishment under his control.

"(3) The course is developed with due consideration to the size and character of the farm or other agricultural establishment on which the eligible veteran will receive his supervised work experience and to the need of such eligible veteran, in the type of farming for which he is training, for proficiency in planning, producing, marketing, farm mechanics, conservation of resources, food conservation, farm financing, farming management, and the keeping of farm and home accounts.

"(4) The eligible veteran will receive not less than one hundred hours of individual instruction per year, not less than fifty hours of which shall be on such farm or other agricultural establishment (with at least two visits by the instructor to such farm each month). Such individual instruction shall be given by the instructor responsible for the veteran's institutional instruction and shall include instruction and home-study assignments in the preparation of budgets, inventories, and statements showing the production, use on the farm, and sale of crops, livestock, and livestock products.

"(5) The eligible veteran will be assured of control of such farm or other agricultural establishment (whether by ownership, lease, management, agreement, or other tenure arrangement) until the completion of his course.

"(6) Such farm or other agricultural establishment shall be of a size and character which (A) will, together with the group-instruction part of the course, occupy the full time of the eligible veteran, (B) will permit instruction in all aspects of the management of the farm or other agricultural establishment of the type for which the eligible veteran is being trained, and will provide the eligible veteran an opportunity to apply to the operation of his farm or other agricultural establishment the major portion of the farm practices taught in the group-instruction part of the course, and (C) will assure him a satisfactory income for a reasonable living under normal conditions at least by the end of his course.

"(7) Provision shall be made for certification by the institution and the veteran that the training offered does not repeat or duplicate training previously received by the veteran.

"(8) The institutional on-farm training meets such other fair and reasonable standards as may be established by the State approving agency.

"§ 1953. Approval of accredited courses

"(a) A State approving agency may approve the courses offered by an educational institution when—

"(1) such courses have been accredited and approved by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association;

"(2) credit for such course is approved by the State department of education for credit toward a high school diploma;

"(3) such courses are conducted under sections 11-28 of title 20; or

"(4) such courses are accepted by the State department of education for credit for a teacher's certificate or a teacher's degree. For the purposes of this chapter the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally rec-

ognized accrediting agencies and associations which he determines to be a reliable authority as to the quality of training offered by an educational institution and the State approving agencies may, upon concurrence, utilize the accreditation of such accrediting associations or agencies for approval of the courses specifically accredited and approved by such accrediting association or agency. In making application for approval, the institution shall transmit to the State approving agency copies of its catalog or bulletin.

"(b) As a condition to approval under this section, the State approving agency must find that adequate records are kept by the educational institution to show the progress of each eligible veteran. The State approving agency must also find that the educational institution maintains a written record of the previous education and training of the veteran and clearly indicates that appropriate credit has been given by the institution for previous education and training, with the training period shortened proportionately and the veteran and the Administrator so notified.

"§ 1954. Approval of nonaccredited courses

"(a) No course of education or training (other than a course of institutional on-farm training) which has not been approved by a State approving agency pursuant to section 1953 of this title, which is offered by a public or private, profit or nonprofit, educational institution shall be approved for the purposes of this chapter unless the educational institution offering such course submits to the appropriate State approving agency a written application for approval of such course in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

"(b) Such application shall be accompanied by not less than two copies of the current catalog or bulletin which is certified as true and correct in content and policy by an authorized owner or official and includes the following:

"(1) Identifying data, such as volume number and date of publication;

"(2) Names of the institution and its governing body, officials, and faculty;

"(3) A calendar of the institution showing legal holidays, beginning and ending date of each quarter, term, or semester, and other important dates;

"(4) Institution policy and regulations on enrollment with respect to enrollment dates and specific entrance requirements for each course;

"(5) Institution policy and regulations relative to leave, absences, class cuts, make-up work, tardiness and interruptions for unsatisfactory attendance;

"(6) Institution policy and regulations relative to standards of progress required of the student by the institution (this policy will define the grading system of the institution, the minimum grades considered satisfactory, conditions for interruption for unsatisfactory grades or progress and a description of the probationary period, if any, allowed by the institution, and conditions of reentrance for those students dismissed for unsatisfactory progress. A statement will be made regarding progress records kept by the institution and furnished the student);

"(7) Institution policy and regulations relating to student conduct and conditions for dismissal for unsatisfactory conduct;

"(8) Detailed schedules of fees, charges for tuition, books, supplies, tools, student activities, laboratory fees, service charges, rentals, deposits, and all other charges;

"(9) Policy and regulations of the institution relative to the refund of the unused portion of tuition fees, and other charges in the event the student does not enter the course or withdraws or is discontinued therefrom;

"(10) A description of the available space, facilities, and equipment;

"(11) A course outline for each course for which approval is requested, showing subjects or units in the course, type of work or skill to be learned, and approximate time and clock hours to be spent on each subject or unit; and

"(12) Policy and regulations of the institution relative to granting credit for previous educational training.

"(c) The appropriate State approving agency may approve the application of such institution when the institution and its non-accredited courses are found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

"(1) The courses, curriculum, and instruction are consistent with quality, content, and length with similar courses in public schools and other private schools in the State, with recognized accepted standards.

"(2) There is in the institution adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide training of good quality.

"(3) Educational and experience qualifications of directors, administrators, and instructors are adequate.

"(4) The institution maintains a written record of the previous education and training of the veterans and clearly indicates that appropriate credit has been given by the institution for previous education and training, with the training period shortened proportionately and the veteran and the Administrator so notified.

"(5) A copy of the course outline, schedule of tuition, fees, and other charges, regulations pertaining to absence, grading policy, and rules of operation and conduct will be furnished the veteran upon enrollment.

"(6) Upon completion of training, the veteran is given a certificate by the institution indicating the approved course and indicating that training was satisfactorily completed.

"(7) Adequate records as prescribed by the State approving agency are kept to show attendance and progress or grades, and satisfactory standards relating to attendance, progress, and conduct are enforced.

"(8) The institution complies with all local, city, county, municipal, State, and Federal regulations, such as fire codes, building and sanitation codes. The State approving agency may require such evidence of compliance as is deemed necessary.

"(9) The institution is financially sound and capable of fulfilling its commitments for training.

"(10) The institution does not utilize advertising of any type which is erroneous or misleading, either by actual statement, omission, or intimation. The institution shall not be deemed to have met this requirement until the State approving agency (A) has ascertained from the Federal Trade Commission whether the Commission has issued an order to the institution to cease and desist from any act or practice, and (B) has, if such an order has been issued, given due weight to that fact.

"(11) The institution does not exceed its enrollment limitations as established by the State approving agency.

"(12) The institution's administrators, directors, owners, and instructors are of good reputation and character.

"(13) The institution has and maintains a policy for the refund of the unused portion of tuition, fees, and other charges in the event the veteran fails to enter the course or withdraws or is discontinued therefrom at any time prior to completion and such policy must provide that the amount charged to the veteran for tuition, fees, and other charges for a portion of the course shall not exceed the approximate pro rata portion of the total charges for tuition, fees, and other charges that the length of the complete portion of the course bears to its total length.

"(14) Such additional criteria as may be deemed necessary by the State approving agency.

"§ 1955. Notice of approval of courses

"The State approving agency, upon determining that an educational institution has complied with all the requirements of this chapter, will issue a letter to such institution setting forth the courses which have been approved for the purposes of this chapter, and will furnish an official copy of such letter and any subsequent amendments to the Administrator. The letter of approval shall be accompanied by a copy of the catalog or bulletin of the institution, as approved by the State approving agency, and shall contain the following information:

"(1) date of letter and effective date of approval of courses;

"(2) proper address and name of each educational institution or training establishment;

"(3) authority for approval and conditions of approval, referring specifically to the approved catalog or bulletin published by the educational institution;

"(4) name of each course approved;

"(5) where applicable, enrollment limitations such as maximum numbers authorized and student-teacher ratio;

"(6) signature of responsible official of State approving agency; and

"(7) such other fair and reasonable provisions as are considered necessary by the appropriate State approving agency.

"§ 1956. Disapproval of course and discontinuance of allowances.

"(a) Any course approved for the purposes of this chapter which fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter shall be immediately disapproved by the appropriate State approving agency. An educational institution or training establishment which has its courses disapproved by a State approving agency will be notified of such disapproval by a certified or registered letter of notification and a return receipt secured.

"(b) The Administrator may discontinue the education and training allowance of any eligible veteran if he finds that the course of education or training in which such veteran is enrolled fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter or if he finds that the educational institution or training establishment offering such course has violated any provisions of this chapter or fails to meet any of its requirements.

"(c) Each State approving agency shall notify the Administrator of each course which it has disapproved under this section.

"Subchapter VII—Miscellaneous Provisions

"§ 1961. Authority and duties of Administrator

"Payments under this chapter shall be subject to audit and review by the General Accounting Office as provided by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 and the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950.

"§ 1962. Educational and vocational counseling

"The Administrator may arrange for educational and vocational counseling to persons eligible for education and training under this chapter. At such intervals as he deems necessary, he shall make available information respecting the need for general education and for trained personnel in the various crafts, trades, and professions. Facilities of other Federal agencies collecting such information shall be utilized to the extent he deems practicable.

"§ 1963. Control by agencies of United States

"No department, agency, or officer of the United States, in carrying out this chapter, shall exercise any supervision or control, whatsoever, over any State approving agency, State educational agency, or State apprenticeship agency, or any educational in-

stitution or training establishment. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prevent any department, agency, or officer of the United States from exercising any supervision or control which such department, agency, or officer is authorized by law to exercise over any Federal educational institution or training establishment, or to prevent the furnishing of education or training under this chapter in any institution or establishment over which supervision or control is exercised by such other department, agency, or officer under authority of existing provisions of law.

"§ 1964. Conflicting interests

"(a) Every officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, or of the Office of Education, who has, while such an officer or employee, owned any interest in, or received any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, any educational institution operated for profit in which an eligible veteran was pursuing a course of education or training under this chapter shall be immediately dismissed from his office or employment.

"(b) If the Administrator finds that any person who is an officer or employee of a State approving agency has, while he was such an officer or employee, owned any interest in, or received any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, an educational institution operated for profit in which an eligible veteran was pursuing a course of education or training under this chapter, he shall discontinue making payments under section 1945 of this title to such State approving agency unless such as may be necessary to terminate the employment of such person and such payments shall not be resumed while such person is an officer or employee of the State approving agency, or State department of veterans affairs or State department of education.

"(c) A State approving agency shall not approve any course offered by an educational institution operated for profit and, if any such course has been approved, shall disapprove each such course, if it finds that any officer or employee of the Veterans Administration, the Office of Education, or the State approving agency owns an interest in, or receives any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, such institution.

"(d) The Administrator may, after reasonable notice and public hearings, waive in writing the application of this section in the case of any officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, of the Office of Education, or of a State approving agency, if he finds that no detriment will result to the United States or to eligible veterans by reason of such interest or connection of such officer or employee.

"§ 1965. Reports by institutions

"(a) Educational institutions and training establishments shall, without delay, report to the Administrator in the form prescribed by him, the enrollment, interruption, and termination of the education or training of each eligible veteran enrolled therein under this chapter.

"(b) The Administrator shall pay to each educational institution which is required to submit reports and certifications to the Administrator under this chapter, an allowance at the rate of \$1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution under the provisions of this chapter to assist the educational institution in defraying the expense of preparing and submitting such reports and certifications. Such allowances shall be paid in such manner and at such times as may be prescribed by the Administrator, except that if any institution fails to submit reports or certifications to the Administrator as required by this chapter, no allowance shall be paid to such institution for the month or months during which such

reports or certifications were not submitted as required by the Administrator.

"§ 1966. Overpayments to veterans

"Whenever the Administrator finds that an overpayment has been made to a veteran as the result of (1) the willful or negligent failure of the educational institution or training establishment to report, as required by this chapter and applicable regulations, to the Veterans' Administration excessive absences from a course, or discontinuance or interruption of a course by the veteran, or (2) false certification by the educational institution or training establishment, the amount of such overpayment shall constitute a liability of such institution or establishment, and may be recovered in the same manner as any other debt due the United States. Any amount so collected shall be reimbursed if the overpayment is recovered from the veteran. This section shall not preclude the imposition of any civil or criminal liability under this or any other law.

"§ 1967. Examination of records

"The records and accounts of educational institutions and training establishments pertaining to eligible veterans who received education or training under this chapter shall be available for examination by duly authorized representatives of the Government.

"§ 1968. False or misleading statements

"In each case where the Administrator finds that an educational institution or training establishment has willfully submitted a false or misleading claim, or where a veteran, with the complicity of an educational institution or training establishment, has submitted such a claim, he shall make a complete report of the facts of the case to the appropriate State approving agency and where deemed advisable to the Attorney General of the United States for appropriate action.

"§ 1969. Information furnished by Federal Trade Commission

"The Federal Trade Commission shall keep all State approving agencies advised of any information coming to its attention which would be of assistance to such agencies in carrying out their duties under this chapter.

"§ 1970. Effective date and retroactive allowances

"The provisions of this chapter shall take effect as of September 1, 1965. In the event this chapter is enacted subsequent to such date, the Administrator shall prescribe regulations for making retroactive payments of education and training allowances, upon application therefor, to eligible veterans for education or training pursued by them on or after September 1, 1965, and prior to the date of the enactment of this chapter."

"(b) The table of contents at the beginning of such title is amended by inserting immediately after

"39. Automobiles for Disabled Veterans..... 1901"

the following:

"40. Education of Veterans Who Served Between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1967..... 1908"

"(c) The table of chapters at the beginning of part III of such title is amended by inserting immediately after

"39. Automobiles for Disabled Veterans..... 1901"

the following:

"40. Education of Veterans Who Served Between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1967..... 1908"

"(d) Such title is further amended—

"(1) by inserting in section 102(a) (2) immediately after 'chapter 33' the following: 'or 40', and by striking out 'chapters 19 and 33' in section 102(b), and inserting in lieu thereof 'chapters 19, 33, and 40';

"(2) by striking out in section 111(a) '33 or 35' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '33, 35, or 40';

"(3) by inserting in section 211(a) after '1961', the following: '1961';

"(4) by striking out in section 1662(b) 'chapters 31 and 35' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'chapters 31, 35, and 40';

"(5) by striking out in section 1711(b) 'chapter 31 or 33', and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'chapter 31, 33, or 40';

"(6) by striking out in section 1734(a) 'chapter 31 or 33' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'chapter 31, 33, or 40';

"(7) by striking out in section 3013 'and 35' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '35 and 40';

"(8) by inserting after 'chapter 35' in section 1611(a) (2) the following: 'or education or training under chapter 40'; and

"(9) by inserting in section 1634 immediately before the comma following 'therein' the following: 'under this chapter or chapter 40'.

"SEC. 7. (a) Chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after section 1817 the following new section:

"§ 1818. Veterans of a period of hostilities

"(a) Each veteran who served on active duty during a period of hostilities shall be eligible for the benefits of this chapter, subject to the provisions of this section, if his total service was for a period of ninety days or more, or if he was discharged or released from a period of active duty, any part of which was served during a period of hostilities, for a service-connected disability.

"(b) No veteran shall be eligible for benefits under this section so long as he is eligible under this chapter for any unused benefits derived from service during World War II or the Korean conflict. Any veteran who is eligible for benefits under this section and who has obtained benefits under this chapter by reason of service during World War II or the Korean conflict shall have his benefits under this section reduced by the amount of any benefits previously obtained under this chapter. Benefits shall not be afforded under this section to any individual on account of service as a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, or the Regular or Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service.

"(c) Loans may be made or guaranteed under this section in the case of any eligible veteran if made not more than ten years from the date of such veteran's discharge or release from his last period of active duty, any part of which occurred during the period of hostilities on which his eligibility is based, plus an additional period equal to one year for each three months of active duty performed by the veteran in such area of hostilities, except that entitlement shall not continue in any case after January 31, 1985, nor shall entitlement expire in any case prior to January 31, 1975.

"(d) If a loan report or an application for loan guaranty relating to a loan authorized by this section is received by the Administrator before the date of the expiration of the veteran's entitlement, the loan may be guaranteed or insured pursuant to the provisions of this section after such date; and if a commitment for a direct loan is issued by the Administrator on or before the date of expiration of the veteran's entitlement, the loan may be made after such date."

"(b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 37 of such title is amended by inserting below

"1817. Release from liability under guaranty."

the following:

"1818. Veterans of a period of hostilities."

"SEC. 8. (a) Section 1901(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking

out 'or the Korean conflict' and inserting in lieu thereof ', the Korean conflict, or a period of hostilities.'

"(b) Section 1905 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: 'In the case of any veteran whose eligibility under this chapter is based upon service performed during a period of hostilities and whose date of discharge or release from active military, naval, or air service preceded the date of enactment of this sentence, the five-year period referred to in the first sentence of this section shall not begin to run until such date of enactment.'

SEC. 9. (a) Section 2101(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after 'Korean conflict' the following: 'or a period of hostilities.'

"(b) Section 2101(b) (1) of such title is amended by striking out 'if he is a commissioned officer,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'if he is a commissioned officer whose eligibility under this chapter is based upon service during the Korean conflict.'

"(c) Section 2102(a) of such title is amended by—

"(1) striking out 'Mustering-out payment for persons eligible under section 2101 of this title shall be in sums as follows:' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(1) Mustering-out payment for persons whose eligibility under section 2101 of this title is based on service during the Korean conflict shall be in sums as follows';

"(2) redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively; and

"(3) adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(2) Mustering-out payments for persons whose eligibility under section 2101 of this title is based on service during a period of hostilities shall be in the sum of \$300."

(d) Section 2102(b) of such title is amended by—

"(1) striking out in the first sentence '(a) (1)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(a) (1) (A) or (a) (2)';

"(2) striking out in the second sentence '(a) (2)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(a) (1) (B)'; and

"(3) striking out in the third sentence '(a) (3)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(a) (1) (C)';

"(e) Section 2104 of such title is amended by—

"(1) striking out in the first sentence 'entitled to mustering-out payment' and inserting in lieu thereof 'entitled to mustering-out payment by virtue of service performed during the Korean conflict and'; and

"(2) inserting after the first sentence a new sentence as follows: 'Any member of the Armed Forces entitled to mustering-out payment by virtue of service performed during a period of hostilities and who was discharged or relieved from active duty under honorable conditions prior to the date of enactment of this sentence shall, if application therefor is made within two years after the date of enactment of this sentence, be paid such payment by the Secretary concerned beginning within one month after application has been received and approved.'

SEC. 10. (a) Chapter 53 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 3111. Authority of President To Designate Areas of Hostilities

"In order that certain provisions of this title, applicable only to veterans who perform service during wartime, may be applicable to veterans who have been called upon, during periods when the United States is not engaged in a formally declared war, to serve in areas of the world in which armed conflict or other warlike conditions exist, the President is authorized to designate by Executive order any area of the world outside the United States as an area of hostilities, if

he finds (1) that members of the Armed Forces will be called upon to serve in such area, and (2) that while serving in such area members of the Armed Forces are likely to be subjected to armed conflict or similar hazardous, warlike conditions. In designating any area of the world as an area of hostilities the President shall identify such area in geographic terms and shall, for purposes of benefits under this title, specify the date on which such area becomes an area of hostilities, and, at such time as he finds that members of the Armed Forces are no longer serving in such area or that warlike conditions no longer exist in such area, specify the date on which such area ceases to be an area of hostilities. No period prior to February 1, 1955, may be designated, under authority of this section, as a period of hostilities.

"(b) The table of chapters at the beginning of chapter 53 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"3111. Authority of President To Designate Areas of Hostilities."

"Amend the title to read as follows: 'A bill to authorize wartime benefits under certain circumstances for peacetime veterans and their dependents.'"

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask that the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Corron] be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CIRCUMVENTION OF THE MALLORY RULE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last Friday I made a speech in the Senate in which I set forth my reasons for objecting to the so-called rules of criminal procedure in the questioning of persons arrested by the Washington, D.C., Police Department.

The RECORD will show that in the course of that speech I said I thought it constituted a scuttling of the Mallory rule.

This morning, in the Washington Post, the lead editorial is entitled "Round Robin Hood's Barn." The first sentence reads:

The Department of Justice and the U.S. attorney have advised the Metropolitan Police Department to circumvent the Mallory rule instead of trying to overturn it by legislation.

Mr. President, the major points in the editorial involve some of the same points that I covered in my speech on Friday night, although I stated additional reasons why I felt the recommendations of Mr. Acheson and Mr. Clark were unsound. I am sure that the Washington Post wrote its editorial without any knowledge of my speech. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 19, 1965]

ROUND ROBIN HOOD'S BARN

The Department of Justice and the U.S. attorney have advised the Metropolitan Police Department to circumvent the Mallory rule instead of trying to overturn it by legislation. While the advice is undoubtedly well meant, we think it is likely to lead to frustra-

tion. Under its terms, the police could detain a suspect in a police station and interrogate him concerning a crime for as much as 3 hours—"exclusive of interruptions." Two clear constitutional objections appear to be raised by this proposal.

Arrest is a very grave matter among free men. The fourth amendment to the Constitution says that it is permissible only when there is probable cause to believe the arrested person guilty of a particular crime. And the existence of probable cause, it follows, is to be determined not by the police in their unchecked discretion but a judicial officer. This is why the law at present requires the police to take an arrested person before a committing magistrate "without unnecessary delay."

To say that the police may hold a suspect in a police station for "investigative purpose" is to permit a return to something uncomfortably reminiscent of the arrests for investigation only recently forbidden by the District Commissioners because they were unconstitutional. The express purpose of Mr. Acheson's recommendation is to enable the police to investigate a crime by questioning a suspect—that is, to obtain, by interrogation, the basis for charging him with a crime and establishing probable cause when he is subsequently taken before a magistrate.

The proposed course seems to us constitutionally indefensible on a second count. In his letter to the Chief of Police, Mr. Acheson wrote: "One under arrest should be permitted to communicate with a lawyer, relative, or friend, and such persons should be given access to him. Such communication or access should not, however, be allowed where there is reason to believe it is sought for the purpose of concealing or destroying evidence or otherwise defeating the ends of justice."

What this seems to say is that an accused person may have the assistance of counsel provided he wants to cooperate with the law; but the Constitution guarantees the assistance of counsel indistinguishably to the innocent and the guilty. If the latter desire a lawyer to "defeat the ends of justice," they are entitled to have him. The burden of proving a crime rests on the prosecution.

Mr. Acheson seems to think that the rights of an arrested person can be met by having a policeman tell him of those rights. He proposes, therefore, that a policeman tell the suspect that he need not answer questions, that he may have a lawyer and that "if you cannot afford a lawyer, one may be appointed for you when you first go to court." What a mockery this would make of the principle of equal justice under law. A rich man could have the help of a lawyer during police interrogation; a poor man could have a lawyer only after he had made damaging admissions and been brought to trial on the basis of them.

In a statement before the Senate District Committee on Thursday, Deputy Attorney General Ramsey Clark, while endorsing the Acheson proposals, made some very sound recommendations for combating crime in the District of Columbia. He urged tightening of the law here relating to the possession of firearms, enlargement of the court of general sessions, better equipment for the Police Department, increased police pay and manpower and similar practical measures for strengthening law enforcement.

At the same time, he urged the committee "to refrain from action in the Mallory area pending a review of experience under the police procedures initiated yesterday." This seems to us extremely good advice. We think, however, that experience with these procedures will lead inevitably to judicial rejection of them as unconstitutional. But this is at least preferable to counseling Congress to enact a law which the courts would be obliged to declare invalid. The

right response to the Mallory rule, in our judgment, is to accept it and live with it as implicit in the concept of ordered liberty.

COLD WAR VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee I support the bill sponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas.

This bill would provide men who have served in the Armed Forces over the last 10 years, and those who follow them, direct assistance with the cost of their higher education and loan assistance for the purchases of homes and farms. This type of program has been in existence since 1944. It is accepted throughout the country. Its procedures are well known and, by this time, easy to administer.

Both the GI bills of World War II and the Korean war created educational opportunities that would not otherwise have existed for many young men. As a result, today there are half a million engineers, over 300,000 teachers, 200,000 men in medical sciences, and close to 160,000 physicists, to mention but a few occupational categories, who are in their careers as a result of the GI bill.

This bill helps finance what every man needs to get started: An education and a home. The men who belong to our armed services for the most part would not be able to afford this start on their own. If their families are well enough off to send them to college, chances are they will not have to serve in the military at all. This is a defect of our system—extremely inequitable, but extremely real.

Nor can they expect to finance what they need to get started with the money they make in the service. The highest ranking private in the Army makes less money in a month than the average factory worker makes in a week. A sergeant with 6 years' service makes only \$60 a week, which is barely above what has been established as poverty level. The average draftee, even if he put all his pay in the bank and spent nothing, could not save enough in a year to cover the average annual tuition costs at a private university.

This is another defect in our system, which we have been trying to remedy in part by the Military Pay Act before us this year. But even the levels of the new act will not do this job.

I have always been deeply committed to the principle that every young American who is qualified for a college education should receive one. I also deeply believe that the Government should do more to bring homeownership within the reach of more people. We have begun a Federal scholarship program—but it is not large. We have a system of college loans—but they do not begin to cover all qualified students who apply. We have a very successful Federal housing insurance program—but interest rates are too high for persons earning under \$6,000 a

year to even consider owning their own homes in most of our centers of population.

Until we can broaden these general programs I believe there is a great need for a specific program, like S. 9, which benefits those who have made a contribution through their military service and who also happen to be greatly in need of such assistance. I look on this bill not so much as an expression of gratitude, but as an extension of opportunity, and an investment in young people. I hope that the Senate will listen to the arguments that have been so carefully developed by the senior Senator from Texas and pass this bill.

I express my appreciation to my colleague from Massachusetts for permitting me to make these few remarks in support of the proposed legislation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the senior Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the Senator from Texas without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I commend the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for his cogent, concise, and effective statement. He is an active and effective member of the Veterans' Subcommittee. He took part actively in the hearings, which were extensive. They were the most complete hearings we have ever had. We covered every facet of the proposed legislation, and I believe that we have shown indisputably the great need for it.

The distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts has been a moving force on the bill in the Veterans' Subcommittee, in the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and now on the floor of the Senate. I commend him for his active, continued, and dynamic interest in the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Texas and also his leadership on this important and fundamental undertaking which the Senate is considering today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the pending Saltonstall amendment there be a time limitation of 1 hour, one-half hour to be under the control of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the other half hour to be under the control of the distinguished sen-

ior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I find that several other Senators desire to speak. If the majority leader would be willing to modify the time for debate to three-quarters of an hour on each side rather than a half hour, I think that would be satisfactory.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I so modify my unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana, as modified? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have offered my amendment, which is a substitute to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield myself such time as I need.

Mr. President, I have offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which is in substance Senate bill 520, that was filed with a number of sponsors on January 15, 1965. That has been rewritten, and it appears on page 17128 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, July 16, 1965.

First, I pay tribute to the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. He worked diligently and effectively on the measure before us today.

For many years the Senator from Texas led the fight for the measure, despite opposition on the part of President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, President Johnson, the Veterans' Administration, the Defense Department, and the Bureau of the Budget.

He has been an articulate and persistent advocate. I wish that he were on my side of this question.

My amendment in the nature of a substitute differs from S. 9 in one fundamental way. I shall first point out that difference, and then explain some of the other differences.

The amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], S. 9, would apply to every veteran who has been a member of the Armed Forces from 1955 to 1967.

My bill, the substitute, would apply to those who have served in areas of hostilities as declared by the President.

For that reason, the number of persons who would be entitled to benefits under the substitute would be the persons who have served in the area of hostilities, as opposed to every member who served in the armed services. That is the primary difference.

The secondary difference is in the benefits.

Under my proposal those eligible for benefits and their dependents would be eligible for benefits in excess of those provided in S. 9.

These benefits I would provide would be similar to those provided veterans of the Korean conflict.

For example, they include, first, eligibility for non-service-connected disability pensions; second, pensions for

widows of veterans killed in service; third, pensions for children of veterans killed in service; fourth, a permanent plan of limited life insurance policies or limited convertible 5-year level premium term policies; fifth, business loans; and sixth, up to \$1,600 toward supplying automobile for service-connected disability; seventh, mustering out pay of \$300.

In addition, the benefits that are provided by S. 9 and by my bill include home and farm loans, and educational benefits up to \$160 a month based on a formula of $1\frac{1}{2}$ times the number of days in active service for up to 36 months.

Those last two benefits are in Senate bill 9, but the other benefits are provided in my bill for men who have served in an area of hostilities.

An argument is made that the President will hesitate to declare an area to be one of hostilities; but that does not apply today to Vietnam and areas adjacent thereto, which have been designated as combat zones for the purpose of giving servicemen in those areas the same kind of tax relief given servicemen during the Korean war. This special tax relief was made retroactive to January 1, 1964. One month and nine days later, the Department of Defense, through directive No. 1340.6, dated June 2, 1965, provided for servicemen in the same area hostile fire pay benefits similar to those extended in the form of combat pay during the earlier conflicts. This order was made effective June 1, 1965. So it is perfectly clear that the areas around Vietnam and in the waters adjacent thereto are today considered hostile areas. These men are actually bearing the brunt of our battle against communism, and their benefits could well be augmented by Congress through providing for them and their dependents on the same basis, and with the same sort of recognition that was given to those who served in World War II.

S. 9, the bill sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Texas, would apply to more than 3 million men today. Its annual cost is estimated to be between \$400 and \$500 million; or for 5 years, as appears in the report, \$1,933 billion. Of course, it is impossible to estimate the cost of the bill with respect to men who are in areas of hostilities, because it is not known how many men will go into such areas. Neither is it known how long they will be there nor what the ultimate situation will be.

The fundamental difference between the two bills is one of giving benefits to men who have served under fire in an area declared by the President to be an area of hostilities, as opposed to giving benefits to every veteran, every member of the armed services, wherever he may have served from 1955 until 1967.

An argument is made that men give up 2 years of their lives when they are asked to serve in the defense of their country. If they are serving in this country, and serving without physical danger to themselves, they can go forward with their educational benefits; they can receive the other benefits to which a man in the service is entitled, including fringe benefits and all other benefits that are provided them. If they are serving in an

area of hostilities, they are entitled to more benefits than if they are not serving in such an area.

Furthermore, men who serve in this country receive useful training in the service itself. So when it is said that they are handicapped during 2 years of their lives, or that they give up 2 years of their lives in the service of their country, that is true; but they will also receive benefits in the days to come, after they leave the service.

It is perfectly clear that the Department of Defense has testified against the bill, because it believes it would handicap the Department in keeping men in the service. The Veterans' Administration is against it. I have read in the minority views that the Veterans of Foreign Wars is against it. We know that the Bureau of the Budget is against it. Three administrations have been against the bill.

I hope that we shall grant benefits to those to whom they are due—that is, to those serving in areas of hostilities—and not spread benefits to those who do not serve in such areas, and thus put these latter servicemen in the same class with respect to benefits as men who are risking their lives in areas of hostility.

I hope my amendment may be substituted for the bill introduced by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Are not men who serve in the Defense Establishment subject to being sent into battle at any time?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I assume they are.

Mr. AIKEN. They have nothing to say as to whether they shall go or not, have they?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; but when they got into areas of hostilities, they would become subject to these benefits. When they entered an area which had been declared to be an area of hostilities they would receive the benefits which would come from the risks and hazards of service in that area.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Reserves are called up, and the National Guard is called into service, they will all be subject to being sent into areas of hostilities, will they not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes; and when they get there, they will be eligible to receive these benefits.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator consider the Dominican Republic an area of hostilities?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is subject to a difference of opinion. So far as I know, the Dominican Republic has not been declared by the President to be an area of hostilities.

Mr. AIKEN. Will not that difference of opinion create much controversy, indecision, and possibly injustice in determining which men shall be subject to the benefits of the Saltonstall amendment and which ones will not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would not say so. I would not agree with the Senator from Vermont, for this reason: The declaration would be up to the President. If the President declared the Dominican

Republic to be an area of hostilities, the men who are serving there would receive these benefits. If he did not declare the Dominican Republic to be an area of hostilities, the men who were killed there and who compiled other war records would be eligible for consideration in a special bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Would a person who served in Da Nang be eligible to receive such benefits, as compared with one who served in Cambridge, Mass.?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Would there be any differential in pay or benefits as between a person who served in South Vietnam and one who served, let us say, in Cambridge, Mass.?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is a great distinction. It is a distinction, if the distinguished Senator listened to me, that I tried to make earlier in my remarks.

Mr. AIKEN. Do they receive exactly the same pay now?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; they do not receive exactly the same pay now, but those serving in South Vietnam do not get these special benefits either. They receive benefits by reason of serving in a combat zone. They get \$50 a month more.

Mr. AIKEN. Has the President ever stated whether he considers the Dominican Republic an area of hostilities?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have not heard that he has; but, if he should do so at a later time, the bill would cover men who served there. If he did not do so at a later time, the dependents of those brave men who have given their lives there should be entitled to special benefits and assistance under a special bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Assuming that half a million men are sent into southeast Asia—and that does not seem to be an unreasonable assumption—will not these men probably be rotated in their service, and will they not all be taking a risk, too?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Certainly. Under my substitute, they would receive the same benefits as those received by veterans who served in Korea, but not the same benefits as those received by men who served in World War II. The difference between Korean War veterans and World War II veterans, as I understand, is that although both classes of veterans received allowances, the Korean war veterans did not receive educational expenses in addition to their allowances.

My amendment provides that those who are serving today in Vietnam would receive the same benefits as those who served in Korea.

Mr. AIKEN. It would be their good luck, perhaps, for those men who are awaiting their turn to serve, if they were not called upon to go to Vietnam.

I am trying to reconcile the situation in my mind. If in doubt, I should prefer to give the benefit to all of them. Perhaps some of them may be called in the Reserves and have to leave their homes. They would have to leave their jobs. Would anything be done to require employers to retain the jobs for these men?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That would not be covered in my proposed measure. I

do not believe that it is covered in the bill of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there is some provision for job retention. However, the problem is that the prospective draftee cannot get hired. The employers look at the draft potentials and fear that when they start to train a man or utilize him in the plant, he will be called up.

The prospect is that a draftee will have great difficulty in securing employment today. He is handicapped all the way around.

I point out that the radio reported this morning that a unit of the 1st Division in Vietnam that was under heavy Communist mortar fire consisted of 60 percent draftees. Those men are being drafted and taken from employment. They are the men who are receiving the rough service, whether they are in Vietnam, in training for replacements, or whether they are endangered by being flown overseas with death facing them.

A plane crashed in southern California. Every one of the 72 marines on board was killed. More than a dozen Air Force men were killed.

Two planes collided en route to Vietnam. Would that be in the area of hostilities?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, when the President declares an area to be an area of hostilities, any man who goes over there, whether he be in an airplane or in a ship, would be in a risk area.

There is a great distinction in my mind between that man and the man who would be receiving educational benefits while serving in a hospital or in a training camp in the United States. The man serving in the United States would receive the benefit of being in the service and in addition, would receive the educational advantages that would accrue to him from the proposed bill. There are many benefits to be realized from serving even though the area of service were not an area of hostilities.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, rather than deny benefits to those who were favored by fate and were not in combat, I should think it would be fair to provide benefits for all and double or triple the benefits for those who go into conflict.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. AIKEN. It would seem to be fair to give the benefits to all of them. They are all subject to the same hazards, depending on the judgment of the President and the generals.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As for those who go into areas of hostility, my amendment would provide seven basic benefits which the bill of the Senator from Texas would not provide.

For instance, any man who goes into these areas, would receive, as do veterans of the Korean conflict:

1. Non-service-connected disability pensions.
2. Pensions for widows of veterans killed in service.
3. Pensions for children of veterans killed in service.
4. Permanent plan life insurance policies or limited convertible 5-year-level premium term policies.
5. Business loans.

6. Up to \$1,600 toward buying automobiles for service-connected disabled, and
7. Mustering-out pay of \$300.

Those benefits would be provided in my amendment for those who served in an area of hostilities, as opposed to the bill of the Senator from Texas, which would provide for the same educational advantages that my amendment would, except that my amendment would provide for the advantages to be given after 90 days of service and the bill of the Senator from Texas would provide for them to be given after 180 days. Both measures would provide for home and farm loans.

I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, we have heard the differential made as between a man serving his country state-side and a man serving in South Vietnam or in the Dominican Republic.

Would the pending measure include men who are on duty on the early warning line, men who are on duty in Alaska, or men who are tied in with scientific and advanced implementation?

It is my understanding that we are trying to do something to repay the boys who have had their lives disturbed by giving up a period of their lives to the service of their country.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MURPHY. A boy is honored to have the privilege of serving his country. However, his life is disturbed whether he serves in a camp such as Camp Pendleton in California or in South Vietnam. The choice is not the boy's.

I wonder if it would not be unfair to restrict the educational allowance to those who have served in an area of hostility, as provided for in the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

I am in complete agreement with the proposal that veterans receive straight benefits for education. It seems that the deciding factor would be whether the life of the veteran would have been disturbed by this period during which he served in the Armed Forces of his country.

We want to give the man an opportunity to make up for the time that he has lost.

There seem to be two things that concern us. There are many places in which one can serve and experience great danger without going to South Vietnam or the Dominican Republic.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, my amendment would afford the same benefits for education as would the bill of the Senator from Texas, except that my amendment would apply after 90 days of service and the bill of the Senator from Texas would apply after 180 days.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I understood the Senator to say that the benefits contained in his proposal would apply only to those who served in a combat area.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is strictly true. However, there are certain educational benefits and other benefits that are now provided for by law. There is the housing bill which we passed the other day, there is the education bill which we

will soon consider, and there is the National Defense Education Act which is already law. The benefits contained in all of those bills would be available to the veterans.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I was merely questioning the differentiation between the giving of education allowances. Whether a man was stationed in South Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, Camp Pendleton in California, on the early warning line, or in Alaska, his life would be interrupted.

It seems to me that he should receive some benefit.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the man who served in Camp Pendleton would receive all the benefits that are offered in the service for bettering his education. Those opportunities are ample, if the Senator will believe me as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. There are ample opportunities afforded to a man in service if he is willing to accept them. They are quite adequate.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

I do not believe it is fair for wartime veterans and peacetime trainees to be given the same advantages and benefits.

There is a great difference between serving in an area in which there is security and serving in an area in which one's life is in constant jeopardy.

The purpose originally, as I understood the World War II and the Korean bill, was to give such benefits to those whose lives were in jeopardy, or who stood to be in jeopardy at a moment's notice in actual combat.

It is an honor for a man to serve his country in peace or in war. I do not look upon one who serves in peacetime as having his life jeopardized to the extent that his country owes him the same consideration given to veterans of World War II or the Korean conflict.

We would not have freedom today if the lives of citizens had not been interrupted and jeopardized in those great and momentous times.

If a young man were to remain in this country, he could attend college in the afternoon and evening or receive training in the service, as so many have done and are doing today. A man serving in an area of hostility could not do that.

I am convinced that the criterion should be whether a man served in an area of hostility. One's life is in jeopardy in an area of hostility. A man can be killed at any moment. However, if a man is back in the States, he can go to school at night. He is not endangered. Why should the man who is serving in the States today receive the same benefits as a man who is fighting in the swamps or in the woods in Vietnam, or the same benefits as soldiers who fought in the Normandy hedgerows in World War II, or in Korea, or in other areas?

It seems to me there is a real distinction that the Congress has recognized up until now in failing to enact the same proposal as is pending now in previous sessions of Congress. I feel that this is wise. I do not say that we ought to follow the same pattern merely because previous administrations have taken similar positions on the proposal, but it is noteworthy that the same plan was advocated during the Eisenhower administration and Congress turned it down. It was advocated during the Kennedy administration and Congress turned it down. It has been turned down so far under the Johnson administration. No action has been taken on it. If the Johnson administration does not favor a bill to spend money, it must be of very dubious merit.

It is my opinion that we ought not pass this bill in its present form. The amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts should be adopted. The bill would cost approximately \$1.93 billion the first 5 years—almost \$2 billion. The Saltonstall amendment would require outlay of funds substantially lower than this.

The main point, however, is I believe, a question of equity. The Saltonstall amendment offers an approach which is more fair, in the long run, to all.

When a young man goes in the service he does not altogether disrupt his life. He receives training in one or more fields, good medical examinations, and many other benefits. He receives dental care benefits. He is compensated for any inconvenience in many and varied ways which I am sure all Senators are aware.

In my opinion, he receives many benefits that a man who is not in the service does not receive. It is important that a man receive this training. So when he is not being harmed or jeopardized or handicapped by going into an area of hostilities, it is my judgment that the man is greatly benefited, whether he goes overseas or elsewhere.

Mr. President, we cannot pay a man what he is worth. No man is paid what he is worth. He is either overpaid or underpaid, based on someone's judgment. We cannot judge what it is worth, on the basis of dollars and cents, for a man to perform a patriotic duty in serving his country.

I believe the Saltonstall amendment should be adopted. I feel that if the amendment is not adopted, the bill probably will not pass. It is my judgment that the House will not pass the bill unless we adopt the Saltonstall amendment, or possibly the Cooper amendment, which will be offered later if the Saltonstall amendment is not adopted. But the Saltonstall amendment gives us a criterion. If a man is serving in an area of hostilities, his life is jeopardized. He may be killed at any moment. Therefore, he is entitled to greater benefits than is someone who serves back home, whose life is not jeopardized or in danger.

The average serviceman can go to school at night, he can visit his family and his friends and go to picture shows and enjoy other forms of entertainment. That is a vastly different situation from

being in an area of hostilities, and should be recognized and treated differently.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment. Some factors have not been brought out so far in the debate which I think should be brought out. First of all, I say with all deference to the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], a sponsor of the major bill, that I have also sat in on a number of hearings, as ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs. I have read the hearings. I admire the tenacity with which the Senator from Texas has supported his thesis. I was happy to vote the bill out of subcommittee so it could be acted upon by the whole committee. But, Mr. President, we have been debating for a couple of days this particular proposal, and on each occasion we keep running up against the statement that we have to do something about the poor young people who have been called into the service against their will and forced into the service. It is interesting that out of the total number of persons on active duty, only 10 percent of them have been drafted. Out of the approximately 2,640,000 in active service, only some 210,000 are draftees. So the large proportion of the persons in the Armed Forces are those who have enlisted voluntarily. They are there to serve their country. They are there to try to do what they can do to support their country and to protect the liberties they think are so worthwhile. Only 10 percent have felt the icy finger of Uncle Sam and have been drafted into the service.

The second question is whether or not we have given them an adequate opportunity to obtain the benefits of educational programs. We are now engaged, in the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in the markup of a higher education bill to supplement the National Defense Education Act and to supplement other educational programs. Three years ago Judge SMITH, chairman of the subcommittee in the House, said he had grave doubt as to whether we should consider in that session any more education bills, because of the fact that he was unable to find out how much money was going out of the Treasury Department into the hands of those who were dispensing the money for purposes of education. If my recollection is correct, it was estimated that there were 24 different types of Federal education programs in existence and that money to the tune of \$2 billion a year was going out of the Treasury to pay for these programs.

It is hard for me to see any real logic in the statement that, unless we pass this bill, these men, when they leave the service, are to be deprived of educational opportunities. It is not a fact. Those who serve in areas of hostility are entitled to some recognition and special help.

Let us see what agencies are for and against the bill of the Senator from

Texas. It seems to me interesting to look at the record of hearings and see what they contain. What does the Defense Department say?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DOMINICK. May I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Let us see what the Department of Defense said on February 26, 1965.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, what page of the hearings is the Senator reading from?

Mr. DOMINICK. Page 66. I shall not read the whole statement, but only a paragraph:

The Department of Defense recognizes that S. 9 involves a question of broad national policy beyond the scope of the Department. However, it must be pointed out that proposals of this nature have a very definite effect on the ability of the Armed Forces to retain qualified personnel. Programs of education and vocational assistance encourage personnel to leave military service immediately after accruing the maximum benefits which can be gained. This results in a serious handicap to the Armed Forces in their efforts to attract and retain qualified personnel on a career basis.

The letter continues and gives more reasons, but on an earlier page of the hearings, page 64, this is what the Veterans' Administration said in its report:

The Veterans' Administration has opposed bills providing peacetime veterans readjustment benefits (such as education and training) on the ground that this type of benefit should be limited to situations where wartime service sharply disrupted career planning and called for special Government aid to ease the transition from wartime service back to civilian life.

This is the kind of program the Senator from Massachusetts is offering in his substitute. It is not the kind of program provided by S. 9. We could go further through the hearing. The veterans organizations themselves are split as to whether it should or should not be passed, but I do not know any veterans organization or any department which is opposed to giving special benefits to those who serve in an area of hostility. This is what the Senator from Massachusetts is trying to do.

At this time, in the areas of hostility already mentioned, and in southeast Asia in particular, we can see the war escalating in front of our eyes. It seems to me, therefore, that this is an appropriate time to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts in lieu of the other amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am not one of those who believe that 2 years of service in the Armed Forces is a drawback physically, mentally, or morally to the average young American. On the contrary, I believe they frequently come out of the service stronger physically

and better morally and mentally than when they went in, and rise up to their highest capacity in civil life.

This morning, I asked the Veterans of Foreign Wars, a leading veterans organization confined to helping those who have served in the Armed Forces on foreign soil in defense of the American flag during the war, what its policy was in regard to this matter, and I have received a letter from it, dated today, enclosing a resolution adopted at its 64th national convention in Seattle, Wash., in August 1963, making it clear that it supports the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, S. 520, which is now offered as a substitute.

I ask unanimous consent to have that letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Kansas City, Mo., July 19, 1965.

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Veterans of Foreign Wars supports readjustment benefits for cold war veterans who have served in areas of hostilities for which a campaign badge or medal was authorized.

This position was laid down and approved at our 64th National Convention which was held in August of 1963 in Seattle, Wash. A copy of the resolution identified as No. 83, entitled "Support S. 1011—Benefits Cold War Veterans" is enclosed.

The bill referred to, S. 1011, 88th Congress, is practically identical to S. 520, 89th Congress, which bill is now pending in the Finance Committee.

The VFW, therefore, supports the proposal contained in S. 520 which will authorize educational, training and housing loan benefits for those veterans whose service has been in areas designated as "hot spots" since the official ending of the Korean conflict on January 31, 1955.

The underlying philosophy of the resolution is that readjustment benefits which were authorized by the GI bills of World War II and the Korean conflict were for wartime veterans. Such benefits, therefore, should be extended and made available to veterans of the cold war whose service is equivalent to wartime service.

It has been always the official position of the VFW that all campaign and expeditionary service for which a badge or medal is authorized should be elevated to wartime service for the purpose of entitlement to veterans rights and benefits.

S. 520 or its equivalent will help carry out our longstanding position in this regard by elevating to wartime status for entitlement to readjustment benefits all service rendered by cold war veterans since the Korean conflict which has been recognized as wartime service by the authorizing of a campaign badge or medal.

Your favorable consideration of these views in your deliberations will be deeply appreciated by the 1,300,000 members of the VFW.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

Enclosure.

RESOLUTION No. 83—SUPPORT S. 1011:
BENEFITS COLD WAR VETERANS

Whereas American servicemen are daily risking life and limb on numerous cold war fronts throughout the world; and

Whereas veterans who served in West Berlin, Laos, Vietnam, the Quemoy and Matsu Islands are eligible to become members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; and

Whereas veterans who served under the United Nations banner in the Congo, although an act of war was never declared by the United States, are also eligible for the Veterans of Foreign Wars; and

Whereas veterans who served in Korea after July 27, 1954, are presently denied membership in the Veterans of Foreign Wars, despite the fact they were subjected to peril, danger and constantly in fear of a hot war erupting; and

Whereas in many instances the service performed by these men serving in these cold war areas is more hazardous than that performed by many wartime veterans; and

Whereas S. 1011 introduced in the Senate of the United States recognizes the hazardous nature of this service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 64th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we support S. 1011, a bill to provide wartime benefits to veterans and their dependents who serve in an area designated by the President as an area of hostilities during the period of hostilities.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I read from the letter in part as follows:

S. 520 or its equivalent will help carry out our longstanding position in this regard by elevating to wartime status for entitlement to readjustment benefits all service rendered by cold war veterans since the Korean conflict which has been recognized as wartime service by the authorizing of a campaign badge or medal.

Your favorable consideration of these views in your deliberations will be deeply appreciated by the 1,300,000 members of the VFW.

Mr. President, without laboring the question, I believe that legislation enacted earlier makes it clear that when a man in cold war service is injured, he is entitled to every help that a veteran injured in war is entitled to, either by way of hospitalization or rehabilitation. The same thing applies to his dependents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. HOLLAND. We have come a long way to recognize the fact that veterans of cold war service who are incapacitated or injured in any way are as much entitled to benefits from the Government as those who received a similar injury in time of war.

I cannot agree that all the vast number of veterans who come out of war without injury of any kind are now entitled to help from the U.S. Government in the way of special treatment. I am glad to see that the Veterans of Foreign Wars recognizes that principle and requests the Senate to recognize it in passing upon this issue.

I strongly support the substitute measure offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield me 30 seconds to direct a question to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Ohio for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the understanding of the Senator from Florida regarding the attitude of the Defense Department, the Veterans' Administration, and the administration itself, on this subject?

Mr. HOLLAND. The letters from the Defense Department and the Veterans' Administration speak for themselves. They are contained in the report. They show that they do not approve the program in the pending bill. This morning, in order to be sure of the position of the White House, I called the White House and asked—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. HOLLAND. I called the White House and asked what its position was. I was called back and advised that it strongly supported the position of the departments as expressed by the Defense Department, the Veterans' Administration—

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Bureau of the Budget, as already communicated to the committee in the hearings.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I know of no other speakers, unless the Senator from Texas has some remarks to make at this time.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I have some comments at this time, but there is another speaker on our side who is on his way into the Chamber, and is expected to be recognized next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and am willing to have the time charged to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the time will be charged to the Senator from Texas; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield myself 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this is not a bonus bill. Men serving overseas receive overseas pay. Soldiers in the shooting zone receive \$50 a month and more. I do not mean that that is enough money, but this is not the kind of bill which offers a reward for hazardous

service in a war zone. There are laws which do that. This bill has a different purpose.

This is a veterans' readjustment bill, not an active military pay bill. Were I to vote for the amendment offered today, I would be saying to those men fighting frostbite in the polar regions, to those men who so valiantly patrol the 38th parallel to Korea, and to the valiant men now in Berlin, that a vote for the pending amendment would be to tell all those veterans that they did not do enough for their country because they were not shot at.

What about the patrols in Korea? I was out there last December. Hand grenades are being lobbed into their posts, these have killed and wounded several of our men who stood guard around the demilitarized zone. Patrols go out around the demilitarized zone from both sides every day. They do so with tommyguns at the ready, with frail barbed wire fence in the middle of the demilitarized zone, and they walk along that fence with their rifles pointed at the man on the other side of the fence, looking at him eye to eye, and then turning away. That is certainly hazardous. If anyone should be trigger-happy, trouble would erupt at any moment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is there anything in the amendment as proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts to prevent the President from declaring the Korean area an area of hostility, if he felt that it deserved that classification?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. No; that is the fault of the proposed amendment. Has the Dominican Republic been declared an area of hostilities? Does the Senator believe that the President will declare the Dominican Republic an area of hostility, and thereby say we are waging war in Latin America?

This shows one of the fallacies of the amendment. I do not expect the President to declare the Dominican Republic an area of hostility. I am pointing out the difficulty of administering such an amendment.

Has the President declared Berlin a crisis area, or as an area of hostility? What about the Cuban crisis, with its buildup of military forces? Is that an area of hostility?

Ships collide and planes collide. It is inevitable that such things should happen in this military buildup.

Two planes collide by touching wings, one plane goes down and the other does not. What about the persons who survive? Are they to be declared not to have been on hazardous duty?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The two 52's collided over the China Sea in a raid from Guam to Vietnam. Is that in an area of hostility? Some of these planes crash on the ramps and kill the personnel in them.

I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, speaking only for the Senator from Florida, I would expect the President of the United States to declare the Dominican Republic an area of hostility. As to the collision of the two B-52's and the men who

were killed, the dependents of those men are completely protected under existing law.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. When ships go down over there and some of the personnel are rescued, that is one thing. Are they declared to be not engaged in hazardous duty?

Are those who were rescued to be declared not to be engaged in hazardous duty, after being in the water for hours?

I cannot feel that we can tell a veteran who has given his time to defend our security that he did not do enough because he was not shot at, or was not facing a rifle at a particular minute.

We did not include such fallacious proposals in past GI bills.

Not once in the history of this country, in connection with these bills, have we told veterans that there is a distinction between those who have been shot at and those who have not been shot at.

Not once in connection with the Korean veterans bill did we say that they did not do enough for us because some of them were not shot at.

A large proportion of our military personnel never goes overseas. In World War II, of the 16 million persons in the armed services, 25 percent in the Army never went overseas; 13 percent of those who served in the Navy never went overseas; 2.9 percent in the Marine Corps during World War II did not go overseas. Untold hundreds of thousands did not go overseas and were never shot at.

Alaska and Hawaii were considered as being overseas in those days. Many areas where there was no shooting war were considered as being overseas.

Everyone was considered a veteran, whether he served in Alaska or Hawaii or in the 48 States on the mainland not contiguous to Alaska. We never placed an artificial geographical limitation in the World War II GI bill. We have never placed an artificial geographical limit on the rights of veterans in any war.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. **Mr. President**, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield such time to the Senator from New York as he may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. **Mr. President**, I join the Senator from Texas in opposing the attempt of the Senator from Massachusetts to confine the aid available under the bill to those who serve in areas of hostility. This provision will be extremely difficult to administer and could be most embarrassing as a foreign policy matter.

It is primarily on the latter argument that I base my opposition.

What, for example, would be the foreign policy implications if the President were to define the Dominican Republic as an area of American hostility because there has been shooting there? Surely it is this kind of danger which the Senator from Massachusetts has in mind when suggesting that the aid should be given only to those who have performed hazardous duty, and just as surely, it could create great difficulties in the conduct of our foreign policy for the President to

designate an area like the Dominican Republic as an area of armed conflict.

The basic purpose of the bill is, in any event, much broader. Its aim is to provide readjustment assistance. Any veteran who has served more than 180 days has given that time out of his life, whether he was sent to an area of hostilities or not. To a large extent, he has no control over where he is sent. The amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Massachusetts thus makes the educational benefits of S. 9 into a roulette wheel sort of opportunity.

As I pointed out in my remarks last Friday, millions of veterans in World War II did not serve in actual areas of hostilities. I believe it would be most unfair if we were to limit the benefits in the way that the Senator from Massachusetts suggests.

I ask: What is an area of hostilities? Should it include any veteran who was ever shot at? How about those who were behind the lines at company headquarters? How about those who manned the ships and planes that brought the troops in? What is the basis for drawing a meaningful line?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. **Mr. President**, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is my understanding that an area of hostilities includes the whole area of South Vietnam and the waters adjacent thereto, as declared by the President.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether he thinks his amendment would have been applied in the case of the Berlin crisis of 1961, which was described at the time by the President as being a very dangerous situation, and where men were praised for the efforts they were making, and the fact that they were standing on a bastion of freedom. How would the Senator designate it?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the bill became law, it would be the responsibility of the President to declare the Berlin area an area of hostilities, if it were an active danger. The same situation would apply to Lebanon, where our troops landed.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Does the Senator believe that the Berlin crisis of 1961 would have presented any foreign policy problem to the President of the United States if he had been confronted with the question whether to designate Berlin as an area of hostility? Can Berlin be designated an area of hostility when the United States occupies that area under a four-power treaty along with three other ostensibly friendly countries?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I see the possibility of that. I would not be honest if I did not say so. I would say that that would be a possibility. However, I would say that in the present instance of Vietnam, it is clear from two declarations, an executive order by the President and an order by the Defense Department. That situation at the present time is clear.

We must remember that there is no state of war here, whereas in the case of Korea a state of war existed, under

the United Nations. Of course, during World War II there was a state of war.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that there is less of a problem with respect to designating Vietnam. But there is a question of how far that area would extend. And I believe that there is a serious problem, which we have not answered, as to the other areas. The mere fact that the President designates areas of danger raises all kinds of serious foreign policy implications.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is some merit in what the Senator has said. I believe that if the bill should become law, the question of what is an area of hostilities will be thought out and decided by the President.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. This is something that we really must consider here. We might specifically write into law an intent covering troops that might serve in Berlin, if that is our intention. But to place that kind of burden or responsibility on the desk of the President really would be asking too much.

With the situation as it is at the present time, I do not believe that it would be a practical possibility for the President of the United States to declare an area such as Berlin an area of hostility.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That question would have to be determined in each instance. I am trying to be fair to the men who are actually risking their lives, as opposed to those who are not risking their lives. The Senator has mentioned a chef in a kitchen. All of those men are in areas of risk. There is a possibility of a bomb dropping on them. We must be as fair to those men as we were to the men who were engaged in Korea and in World War II. That is all I am trying to do.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am in favor of that. We do not have any problem in relation to the men who have actually served in Vietnam. However, I have raised the question of the great risk to men serving in other places. For example, I remember that after October 12, 1961, when the 3,000 American troops came from Germany into Berlin, there was a great deal of attention given to the question of what dangers they faced. That was a difficult assignment for all of those men. Yet it was handled very well. Those men were in great danger.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They were in great danger. If some shooting had occurred, perhaps it would immediately have become an area of hostility. The question is similar to a number of difficult diplomatic questions that arise. It must be answered and answered in a way that will be of benefit to our country.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. If the test should be whether shooting occurred, I should like to point out that shooting did occur during that period of time, not when the 3,000 men came in, but during the period from August to September 1961. Under the Senator's amendment, would the area of Germany and Berlin have then become an area of hostility?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from New York has posed a difficult question. Looking backward, I would be

sorry if it had been. However, under the provisions of my amendment, it would be up to the President to decide whether or not it was an area of hostilities for the purposes of additional veterans benefits. I do not believe the Senator from New York or I could answer that question specifically, although the Senator from New York was very close to that situation.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Even if we reached some conclusion as to how the Berlin question would be handled, would that conclusion cover every situation? Even in the Caribbean? In the Caribbean our ships have been shot at. Would the whole Caribbean area become an area of hostility?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not believe so. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] asked me that question when the Senator from New York was not in the Chamber. In the Cuban crisis, while some of our men lost their lives, no declared hostilities occurred. We could always pass a special bill which would cover a situation of that kind. I believe that is an even more difficult question than the question which the Senator posed about Berlin.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. What about South Korea? Would the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts cover South Korea?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. South Korea was declared an area of hostilities. There was a state of war in Korea.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. At the present time would any serviceman who is serving in South Korea be eligible?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would not think so. I would have to look up that question to determine whether we are still in a state of war with North Korea or whether we are in a truce, which would indicate that we were not in a state of war.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. If the Senator uses the criterion of people being shot at, I point out that every week in Korea men are losing their lives. There are instances of that every week.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to answer every question as truthfully as I can.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I know that; the Senator from Massachusetts always does.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am not certain as to whether a state of war still exists in Korea. If it did, the men in Korea would be covered; if it did not, the question would arise as to whether it is an area of hostilities. I do not understand that it is, but I am not sure whether there is a state of war in Korea or not.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I know that the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts would give the President authority to declare as areas of hostility those areas in which the United States is engaged with hostile forces. It would also give the President the power to say when those hostilities had ceased and when such areas ceased to be areas of hostilities.

In my opinion, the proposed amendment is merely a substitute for a declara-

tion of war and the signing of a peace treaty. It would, in effect, give the President authority to establish a war area and commit the United States to a war area; and when a decision had been reached, to declare that the war was over without any other formalities whatsoever. Would not the Senator from New York agree with that interpretation?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is a very dangerous situation.

Mr. AIKEN. Why do we not turn everything over to the President while we are about it? In some respects we seem to be on the way. The amendment might be a good long step in that direction.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I doubt very much that the President of the United States or the executive branch of the Government would desire that kind of power or that kind of responsibility. Although it might be advisable in order to give some of our young men assistance in their education, it might be completely inadvisable from the point of view of our whole foreign policy responsibility. Just think of the implications which the determination envisaged by the Saltonstall amendment would have, for example, for our relationship with the nations of Latin America if that determination were to be made concerning the Dominican Republic; for our relationship with the Soviet Union, France, West Germany, and England, if that determination were to be made with respect to Berlin; and for our relationship with Japan and South Korea, if North Korea or China were to be declared an area of hostilities.

Mr. AIKEN. Would not the amendment almost give to the President power to say to another country with which he might be having a serious disagreement that if that country wished to make something of it, he would declare that country a hostile area? Might that not occur in some of the Latin American countries to which we might be called upon to send troops for emergency purposes? That is vast power to give to the President.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. As I have said, I do not believe that the President would desire that power.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not believe that a President, unless he was a most unusual President, would wish that power.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I yield the floor back to the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I thank the distinguished Senator from New York. I believe that the colloquy between the senior Senator from Massachusetts and the junior Senator from New York, participated in by the able Senator from Vermont, shows the utter unworkability of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts. The colloquy shows that it would make more difficult the formulation of our foreign policy. Most interestingly, the Senator from Massachusetts agreed with the Senator from New York that it would be very difficult to

administer and to determine what was an era of hostility. For example, questions arose as to the Dominican Republic and Berlin.

Finally, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts said that he thought Berlin would certainly have been an area of hostilities. In response to a question asked by the distinguished junior Senator from New York as to how far we might go in respect to West Germany, as to whether the amendment would apply to those in supply fields back in France or the supply lines that we had into Berlin, it was shown that the difficulty of administration would be insuperable. Practically all who participated in the colloquy agreed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have yielded myself only 3 minutes. I shall yield in a moment.

The amendment which has been offered is indeed an anomaly, for, on the one hand, it admits to the need for readjustment benefits, but, on the other it sets up a standard that indeed has absolutely no causal connection, rational relation, or bearing at all on the reason why these readjustment benefits should be provided to our cold war veterans.

If a need for readjustment benefits exists for a veteran who has to go into hazardous areas, then it also exists for any veteran.

Were I to vote for this amendment that was offered today, I would be saying to those men who are victims of frostbite in the polar regions, to those soldiers who so valiantly patrol the 38th parallel in Korea, and the valiant men in Berlin—yes, a vote for this amendment tells all these veterans that they just did not do enough for their country because they were not shot at.

I cannot believe that any of us here today are going to tell a veteran who has given of his time to defend our security that he did not do enough because he was not facing the right peril, or perhaps the right rifle was not pointed at him. It has always been my feeling—and, indeed, I think the Department of Defense views it this way—that our entire defense system was a team effort. All of our soldiers had a place in our defense, and we did not set up standards whereby a soldier was not as good as another. Especially when it is based on such unsound reasons that one veteran was not shot at and, therefore, he does not need to fulfill his intellectual capacities. I fail to see the reasoning for such a view. We have not been presented with a sound reason why this bill should be so limited.

Nor did we see such a fallacious proposal adopted in the past under other GI bills. Not once did we tell the veterans of World War II and Korea that they could not have the GI bill benefits because they just did not do enough in our war effort.

In further corroboration of what was stated, there has never been a distinction between veterans who have served overseas and those who have served at home. During the Korean war a great majority of our men in the military services never went overseas. Thirty-four percent of

the Army never went overseas in the Korean conflict. Seventy-nine percent of the Navy never went into the combat zone in Korea. Sixty-one percent of the Marine Corps never went there. Sixty-one percent of the Air Force never went there. A majority of all our armed services during the Korean conflict never went to Korea from any branch of the service. Yet we realize that our defense effort was a team effort. We did not cut it in two and say to the half that did not participate in Korea, "You were not a part of this effort." It was a team effort. We did not discriminate on such an artificial basis in relation to the veterans of the Korean war as we would under the proposal of the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

In addition, the actual hostilities in Korea ceased on July 7, 1953, and yet any veteran who entered the service up to and through the 31st of January 1955 was eligible for readjustment benefits—almost a year and a half later. It was not a case of limiting readjustment benefits either to hostile areas, or even to periods of hostility. For about a year and a half after the so-called Korean conflict was absolutely over people who entered the service still drew benefits. It is a misnomer to say that there has been no cold war period in our history when readjustment benefits were granted.

The need for readjustment benefits has no relation to the type of military duty that a man performs. Rising costs of education do not bear a lighter burden on a veteran who has walked beside the Berlin wall than on one who is in Saigon. The bill is not a combat soldiers' pay bill; it is a veterans' readjustment bill. It provides benefits to the veteran after he leaves the armed services.

The purpose of the bill, as is the purpose of all other GI bills, is to allow servicemen to readjust to civilian life, not to reward them for their military duty. It is more than shortsighted to say that only veterans who served in areas of hostility need education; it is a complete avoidance of the purposes of the bill and of our national interest.

The correct way to reward combat is through advantages enjoyed while in the military service. This is being done to give soldiers serving in combat pay and by exempting those men from the income tax. Also, a bill is now pending to give soldiers serving in combat zones special indemnity insurance and to provide them with educational and readjustment benefits, too. But such benefits should not be refused to all other veterans.

What possible logic can be used to say that only veterans of hostile areas need readjustment benefits? If it is the mental strain, why not give benefits to those in military service who have stood guard all night? The argument is no more ludicrous than that offered by this amendment today.

Unless the purpose of the amendment is to cripple readjustment benefits entirely, I suggest that its proponents re-examine the purpose of previous GI bills.

Section 1610(c) of title 38 of the United States Code states:

(c) The Congress of the United States hereby declares that the veterans' education and training program created by this chapter is for the purpose of providing vocational readjustment and restoring lost educational opportunities to those service men and women whose educational or vocational ambitions have been interrupted or impeded by reason of active duty.

This was the purpose of the World War II GI bill; it was the purpose of the Korean war GI bill. It is the purpose of the bill now being considered. "Interruption or impeded" educational or vocational ambitions do not bear relation to where a soldier serves, but to the fact that he or she does serve.

The bill follows our experience with 16 million veterans of World War II and 4,750,000 veterans of the Korean war.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts is indeed not a minor change in the bill, but a complete reversal of purpose. Its proponents are trying to use the bill to reward certain soldiers. I agree that they should be rewarded for their risks, but that should be done in a manner consistent with our defense policies of the past, by combat pay or other means, but not discriminating against other members of our defense team.

The basis of the bill is education; and the American view is that any person should be afforded an opportunity to accomplish his educational goals if he has the capacity. The basis of the amendment is reward—the idea that something extra should be given to soldiers who are engaged in hazardous duties. But the reasoning of the amendment bears no relation to education, for education affects every veteran.

I strongly urge the rejection of the amendment as being inconsistent with the purposes of the bill, which is a veterans' readjustment bill. The amendment would result in the perpetuation of injustice on the majority of veterans. It is not in the national interest to discriminate against veterans who are drafted and who serve where they are sent. Soldiers have no control over where they are ordered to duty.

In answer to the proponents of the amendment, who say that only 10 percent of such veterans were considered drafted, I ask, Where are the draftees in the front lines this morning? Sixty percent of the first division unit under fire were draftees. Every veteran ought to receive benefits, whether he served in a hostile area or not. Many veterans of World War II and the Korean war did not serve in hostile areas; yet readjustment benefits are provided to all those veterans, wherever they served, whether in America or overseas, whether they were shot at or not. The company records do not disclose whether a man was shot at or not. Readjustment benefits should be provided on a basis of the period of service. The pending bill is based on the period of service.

I submit that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts should be rejected.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I share the view of the distinguished sponsor of the bill, which I have supported from the very beginning, that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts would nullify the purpose of the bill. We cannot afford to have two or more classes of veterans, which is precisely what the amendment would create. Once a man is called to the colors, and goes where he is sent, there is no justification whatever for making arbitrary classifications which, as has been pointed out, would be almost impossible to enforce. What would be a combat zone today would cease to be such a zone tomorrow, and vice versa. Therefore, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Alaska for his powers of analysis and for so clearly pointing out the administrative difficulties and the basic unfairness of the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I have 3 minutes?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts. I shall do so because I believe that the principle upon which the amendment is built is sound.

I cannot dismiss from my mind the fact that the President, the Department of Defense, and the Veterans' Administration do not support the proposal offered by the Senator from Texas. The President and his Cabinet have uniformly supported practically every measure that has come before this body contemplating the promotion of educational opportunity. I should like to enumerate those programs, but I do not have them immediately at my command. However, I do not know of a single one that has not had the ardent support of the President.

No one can make me believe that if the argument of the proponents of the bill were sound, the bill would not have the support of the White House, the Veterans' Administration, and the Department of Defense.

I am a veteran of World War I. I join in the expressions made on the floor of the Senate that the training received in the military cannot be dismissed as an idle piece of work. I know of no training that I ever had in my life that was of greater help to me than that which I received in the military

service. I learned to appreciate the attribute of punctiliousness. I knew what it meant, as a member of the military, to apply myself to my work. I do not want to join those who say that service under the flag of our country is the rendition of something that one ought not to give except upon the receipt of extraordinary compensation. In my judgment, if that were the attitude back in 1776, this country would not exist today.

Moreover, I point out that nations have suffered demise when they reached the point where their youth were unwilling to serve except upon the granting of liberal extraordinary compensation. Take whatever country we will, and we will find that the beginning of the collapse was when it was no longer possible to induce the youth, on a voluntary basis, to stand up in support of the banner of their country.

I am glad to support the amendment. I shall support the granting of every type of aid to those who are engaged in what are called the perilous problems of war. But the bill is intended to give to 2.6 million awards supposedly connected with the rendition of dangerous service, when in fact there are only two areas where such real peril exists.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum. I ask unanimous consent, together with the Senator from Texas, that the time consumed for the quorum call not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSING ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 7984.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7984) to assist in the provision of housing for low and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. SPARK-

MAN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. TOWER conferees on the part of the Senate.

COLD WAR VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as remains.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, we are all proud of our servicemen. We are proud of the men who are giving their time today in the Armed Forces. However, especially do we need to give special benefits to those who are actively risking their lives.

The situation today is that our servicemen who are serving under warlike conditions are not receiving wartime benefits.

I and my colleagues who join me in sponsoring the substitute measure believe that the situation should be corrected. The fact that members of the armed services are subject to special risks and dangers should be recognized by the law as it is beginning to be recognized by this administration, which recently granted special tax exemption for the men serving in Vietnam and which, by a declaration of the Department of Defense, declared that an area of hostilities existed in that area of the world.

The distinction between my substitute measure and the bill of the Senator from Texas is that the men who are serving in an area of hostilities receive the same benefits as do the men who served in Korea, and almost the same benefits as did the men who served in World War II—not quite the same as the World War II veterans, but the same as the Korean veterans.

In my judgment, the men who serve in an area of hostilities are entitled to those benefits.

That is the simple difference between the two measures.

I hope that my substitute amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the junior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am honored to support the bill introduced and so ably handled by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. I am against the pending amendment.

In this chaotic day in which we live, how can it be said that the lives and the bodies of some servicemen in any part of the world are any less in jeopardy than those who are actually engaged in what has been termed hostilities in this amendment? All can be called on a moment's notice to a crisis area.

I believe the United States of America owes the same kind and character of

responsibility to all its servicemen, wherever they serve.

I hope that the bill of the Senator from Texas will be passed and that the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts will not be agreed to.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 52, as follows:

[No. 189 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Allott
Bennett
Boggs

Carlson
Church
Cooper

Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen

Dominick	McClellan	Scott
Ellender	Morton	Simpson
Fannin	Mundt	Smathers
Hickenlooper	Murphy	Stennis
Holland	Pearson	Thurmond
Javits	Prouty	Tower
Jordan, Idaho	Robertson	Williams, Del.
Kuchel	Russell, Ga.	Young, N. Dak.
Lausche	Saltonstall	Young, Ohio

NAYS—52

Aiken	Hartke	Montoya
Anderson	Hayden	Morse
Bartlett	Hill	Moss
Bass	Inouye	Muskie
Bayh	Jackson	Nelson
Bible	Kennedy, Mass.	Pastore
Burdick	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, Mo.	Proxmire
Cannon	Long, La.	Randolph
Case	Magnuson	Russell, S.C.
Clark	Mansfield	Smith
Dodd	McCarthy	Symington
Fong	McGee	Talmadge
Fulbright	McGovern	Tydings
Gore	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	McNamara	Yarborough
Harris	Mondale	
Hart	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—12

Brewster	Ervin	Miller
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Neuberger
Douglas	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Eastland	Metcalfe	Sparkman

So Mr. SALTONSTALL's amendment was rejected.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment in the nature of a substitute will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment in the nature of a substitute be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment in the nature of a substitute will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by Mr. DOMINICK, is to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That this Act shall be known as the "Southeast Asia Combat Veterans' Educational Assistance Act".

SEC. 2. (a) Title 38 of the United States Code is amended by adding after chapter 39 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 40—EDUCATION OF VETERANS WHO SERVE IN THE SOUTHEAST ASIA THEATER OF OPERATIONS

"Subchapter I—Definitions

"Sec.

"1908. Definitions.

"Subchapter II—Eligibility

"1910. Entitlement to education or training generally.

"1911. Duration of veteran's education or training.

"1912. Commencement; time limitations.

"1913. Expiration of all education and training.

"Subchapter III—Enrollment

"1920. Selection of program.

"1921. Applications; approval.

"1922. Change of program.

"1923. Disapproval of enrollment in certain courses.

"1924. Discontinuance for unsatisfactory progress.

"1925. Period of operation for approval.

"1926. Institutions listed by Attorney General.

"Subchapter IV—Payments to veterans

"1931. Education and training allowance.

"1932. Computation of education and training allowances.

"1933. Measurement of courses.

"1934. Overcharges by educational institutions.

"Subchapter V—State approving agencies

"1941. Designation.

"1942. Approval of courses.

"1943. Cooperation.

"1944. Use of Office of Education and other Federal agencies.

"1945. Reimbursement of expenses.

"Subchapter VI—Approval of courses of education and training

"1951. Apprentice or other training on the job.

"1952. Institutional on-farm training.

"1953. Approval of accredited courses.

"1954. Approval of nonaccredited courses.

"1955. Notice of approval of courses.

"1956. Disapproval of courses and discontinuance of allowances.

"Subchapter VII—Miscellaneous provisions

"Sec.

"1961. Authority and duties of Administrator.

"1962. Educational and vocational counseling.

"1963. Control by agencies of United States.

"1964. Conflicting interests.

"1965. Reports by institutions.

"1966. Overpayments to veterans.

"1967. Examination of records.

"1968. False or misleading statements.

"1969. Information furnished by Federal Trade Commission.

"1970. Effective date and retroactive allowances.

"Subchapter I—Definitions

"§ 1908. Definitions.

"(a) For the purpose of this chapter—

"(1) The term 'basic service period' means the period beginning on January 1, 1961, and ending on such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress;

"(2) The term 'southeast Asia theater of operations' means any area in southeast Asia in which armed conflict or warlike conditions exist as determined by the President. The geographic description of any such area shall be prescribed by the President from time to time by Executive order. Any change in the geographic limits of any such area by the President shall not affect the eligibility of any veteran who qualified for benefits under this title prior to such change.

"(3) The term 'eligible veteran' means any veteran who is not on active duty and who—

"(A) served on active duty in the southeast Asia theater of operations at any time during the basic service period;

"(B) was discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable; and

"(C) served on active duty for a period of more than one hundred and eighty days (exclusive of any period he was assigned by the Armed Forces to a civilian institution for a course of education or training which was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians, or as cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies), or was discharged or released from a period of active

duty, any part of which was performed in the southeast Asia theater of operations during the basic service period, for an actual service-connected disability.

"(4) The term 'program of education or training' means any single unit course or subject, any curriculum, or any combination of unit courses or subjects, which is generally accepted as necessary to fulfill requirements for the attainment of a predetermined and identified educational, professional, or vocational objective.

"(5) The term 'course' means an organized unit subject matter in which instruction is offered within a given period of time or which covers a specific amount of related subject matter for which credit toward graduation or certification is usually given.

"(6) The term 'dependent' means—

"(A) a child of an eligible veteran;

"(B) a parent of an eligible veteran, if the parent is in fact dependent upon the veteran; and

"(C) the wife of an eligible veteran, or, in the case of an eligible veteran who is a woman, her husband if he is in fact dependent upon her.

"(7) The term 'educational institution' means any public or private elementary school, secondary school, vocational school, correspondence school, business school, junior college, teachers college, college, normal school, professional school, university, scientific or technical institution, or other institution furnishing education for adults.

"(8) The term 'training establishment' means any business or other establishment providing apprentice or other training on the job, including those under the supervision of a college or university or any State department of education, or any State apprenticeship agency, or any State board of vocational education, or any joint apprentice committee, or the Bureau of Apprenticeship established in accordance with chapter 4C of title 29, or any agency of the Federal Government authorized to supervise such training.

"(9) The term 'State' includes the Canal Zone.

"(10) The term 'Commissioner' means the United States Commissioner of Education.

"(b) Benefits shall not be afforded under this chapter to any individual on account of service as a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, or of the Regular or Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service.

"(c) The Congress of the United States hereby declares that the veterans' education and training program created by this chapter is for the purpose of providing vocational readjustment and restoring lost educational opportunities to those service men and women whose educational or vocational ambitions have been interrupted or impeded by reason of active duty performed in the southeast Asia theater of operations during the basic service period, and for the purpose of aiding such persons in attaining the educational and training status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained had they not served their country.

"Subchapter II—Eligibility

"§ 1910. Entitlement to education or training generally

"Each eligible veteran shall, subject to the provisions of this chapter, be entitled to the education or training provided under this chapter.

"§ 1911. Duration of veteran's education or training

"(a) Each eligible veteran shall be entitled to education or training under this chapter for a period equal to one and a half times the duration of his service on active duty during his basic service period (or to the equivalent thereof in part-time training), except that—

"(1) in computing the duration of such service, there shall be excluded a period equal

to any period he was assigned by the Armed Forces to a civilian institution for a course of education or training which was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians or served as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies;

"(2) the period of education or training to which an eligible veteran shall be entitled under this chapter shall not, except as provided in subsection (b), exceed thirty-six months reduced by a period equivalent to any period of educational assistance afforded him under chapters 33 and 35 of this title; and

"(3) the period of education or training to which an eligible veteran shall be entitled under this chapter together with vocational rehabilitation training received under chapter 31 of this title, and education or training received under part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1(a), and section 12(a) of the Act enacting this title shall not, except as provided in subsection (b), exceed thirty-six months in the aggregate.

"(b) Whenever the period of entitlement to education or training under this chapter of an eligible veteran who is enrolled in an educational institution regularly operated on the quarter or semester system ends during a quarter or semester and after a major part of such semester or quarter has expired, such period shall be extended to the termination of such unexpired quarter or semester. In all other courses offered by educational institutions, whenever the period of eligibility ends after a major portion of the course is completed such period may be extended to the end of the course or for nine weeks, whichever is the lesser period.

"(c) In the case of any eligible veteran who is pursuing any program of education or training exclusively by correspondence, one-fourth of the elapsed time in following such program of education or training shall be charged against the veteran's period of entitlement.

"§ 1912. Commencement; time limitations

"(a) No eligible veteran shall be entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter after three years after his discharge or release from active duty or after three years after the date of enactment of this chapter, whichever is later. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, any otherwise eligible veteran whom the Administrator determines to have been prevented from initiating a program of education or training under this chapter within the period prescribed by the preceding sentence because he had not met the nature of discharge requirements of section 1908(a)(1)(B) of this title before a change, correction, or modification of a discharge or dismissal made pursuant to section 1553 of title 10, the correction of the military records of the proper service department under section 1552 of title 10, or other corrective action by competent authority, shall be permitted to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter within three years the date of his discharge or dismissal was so changed, corrected, or modified, or within three years after the date of enactment of this chapter, whichever is later.

"(b) The program of education and training of an eligible veteran under this chapter shall, on and after the delimiting date for the veteran to initiate his program, be pursued continuously until completion, except that an eligible veteran may suspend the pursuit of his program for periods of not more than twelve consecutive months, and may suspend the pursuit of such program for longer periods if the Administrator finds that the suspension for each such period was due to conditions beyond the control of the eligible veteran.

"§ 1913. Expiration of all education and training

"No education or training shall be afforded an eligible veteran under this chapter beyond

eight years after his discharge or release from active duty or eight years after the enactment of this chapter, whichever is later, except that any veteran who is eligible initiate a program of education or training by reason of the second sentence of section 1912 (a) of this title shall be permitted to pursue, subject to the other provisions of this chapter, such program for a period of not more than five years after the date of initiation thereof.

"Subchapter III—Enrollment

"§ 1920. Selection of program

"Subject to the provisions of this chapter, each eligible veteran may select a program of education or training to assist him in attaining an educational, professional, or vocational objective at any educational institution or training establishment selected by him, whether or not located in the State in which he resides, which will accept and retain him as a student or trainee in any field or branch of knowledge which such institution or establishment finds him qualified to undertake or pursue. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, an eligible veteran may not pursue a program of education or training at an educational institution or training establishment which is not located in a State, unless such program is pursued at an approved educational institution of higher learning. The Administrator in his discretion may deny or discontinue the enrollment under this chapter of any veteran in a foreign educational institution if he finds that such enrollment is not for the best interest of the veteran or the Government.

"§ 1921. Applications; approval

"Any eligible veteran who desires to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter shall submit an application to the Administrator which shall be in such form, and contain such information, as the Administrator shall prescribe. The Administrator shall approve such application unless he finds that such veteran is not eligible for or entitled to the education or training applied for or that his program of education or training fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter, or that the eligible veteran is already qualified, by reason of previous education and training, for the educational, professional, or vocational objective for which the courses of the program of education or training are offered. The Administrator shall notify the eligible veteran of the approval or disapproval of his application.

"§ 1922. Change of program

"(a) Subject to the provisions of section 1921 of this title, each eligible veteran (except an eligible veteran whose program has been interrupted or discontinued due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application) may, at any time before the end of the period during which he is entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter, make not more than one change of program of education or training.

"(b) Each eligible veteran, who has not made a change of program of education or training before the expiration of the period during which he is entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter, may make not more than one change of program of education or training with the approval of the Administrator. The Administrator shall approve such a change if he finds that—

"(1) the eligible veteran is not making satisfactory progress in his present program and that the failure is not due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application, and if the program to which the eligible veteran desires to change is more in keeping with his aptitude or previous education and training; or

"(2) the program to which the eligible veteran desires to change, while not a part of the program currently pursued by him, is a normal progression from such program.

"(c) As used in this section the term 'change of program of education or training' shall not be deemed to include a change from the pursuit of one program to pursuit of another where the first program is prerequisite to, or generally required for, entrance into pursuit of the second.

"§ 1923. Disapproval of enrollment in certain courses

"(a) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran in any bartending course, dancing course, or personality development course.

"(b) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran—

"(1) in any photography course or entertainment course; or

"(2) in any music course—instrumental or vocal—public speaking course, or course in sports or athletics such as horseback riding, swimming, fishing, skiing, golf, baseball, tennis, bowling, sports officiating, or other sport or athletic courses, except courses of applied music, physical education, or public speaking which are offered by institutions of higher learning for credits as an integral part of a program leading to an educational objective; or

"(3) in any other type of course which the Administrator finds to be avocational or recreational in character:

unless the eligible veteran submits justification showing that the course will be of bona fide use in the pursuit of his present or contemplated business or occupation.

"(c) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of any eligible veteran, not already enrolled, in any nonaccredited course below the college level offered by a proprietary profit or proprietary nonprofit educational institution for any period during which the Administrator finds that more than 85 per centum of the students enrolled in the course are having all or any part of their tuition, fees, or other charges paid to or for them by the educational institution or the Veterans' Administration under this chapter, chapter 31 of this title, or section 12(a) of the Act enacting this title.

"§ 1924. Discontinuance for unsatisfactory progress

"The Administrator shall discontinue the education and training allowance of an eligible veteran if, at any time, he finds that, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the educational institution or training establishment, the conduct or progress of such veteran is unsatisfactory.

"§ 1925. Period of operation for approval

"(a) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran in any course offered by an educational institution when such course has been in operation for less than two years.

"(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to—

"(1) any course to be pursued in a public or other tax-supported educational institution;

"(2) any course which is offered by an educational institution which has been in operation for more than two years, if such course is similar in character to the instruction previously given by such institution;

"(3) any course which has been offered by an institution for a period of more than two years, notwithstanding the institution has moved to another location with the same general locality; or

"(4) any course which is offered by a nonprofit educational institution of college level and which is recognized for credit toward a standard college degree.

"§ 1926. Institutions listed by Attorney General

"The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of, or payment of an education and training allowance to, any eligible veteran in any course in an educational institution or training establishment while it is listed by the Attorney General under section 3 of part III of Executive Order 9835, as amended.

"Subchapter IV—Payments to veterans

"§ 1931. Education and training allowance

"(a) The Administrator shall pay to each eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training under this chapter, and who applies therefor, an education and training allowance to meet in part the expenses of his subsistence, tuition, fees, supplies, books, and equipment.

"(b) The education and training allowance for an eligible veteran shall be paid, as provided in section 1932 of this title, only for the period of the veterans' enrollment as approved by the Administrator, but no allowance shall be paid—

"(1) to any veteran enrolled in an institutional course which leads to a standard college degree or a course of institutional on-farm training for any period when the veteran is not pursuing his course in accordance with the regularly established policies and regulations of the institution and the requirements of this chapter;

"(2) to any veteran enrolled in an institutional course which does not lead to a standard college degree or in a course of apprenticeship or other training on the job for any day of absence in excess of thirty days in a twelve-month period, not counting as absences weekends or legal holidays established by Federal or State law during which the institution or establishment is not regularly in session or operation; or

"(3) to any veteran pursuing his program of education exclusively by correspondence for any period during which no lessons were serviced by the institution.

"(c) No education and training allowance shall be paid to an eligible veteran for any period until the Administrator shall have received—

"(1) from the eligible veteran (A) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in an institutional course which leads to a standard college degree or a course of institutional on-farm training, a certification that he was actually enrolled in and pursuing the course as approved by the Administrator, or (B) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in an institutional course which does not lead to a standard college degree or a course of apprenticeship or other training on the job, a certification as to actual attendance during such period, or (C) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in a program of education or training by correspondence, a certification as to the number of lessons actually completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution; and

"(2) from the educational institution or training establishment, a certification, or an endorsement on the veteran's certificate, that such veteran was enrolled in and pursuing a course of education or training during such period, and, in the case of an institution furnishing education or training to a veteran exclusively by correspondence, a certification, or an endorsement on the veteran's certificate, as to the number of lessons completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution.

Education and training allowances shall, insofar as practicable, be paid within twenty days after receipt by the Administrator of the certifications required by this subsection.

"§ 1932. Computation of education and training allowances

"(a) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training in an educational institution and is not entitled

to receive an education and training allowance under subsection (b), (c), (d), (e), or (f) shall be computed as follows:

"(1) If such program is pursued on a full-time basis, such allowance shall be computed at the rate of \$110 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of \$135 per month, if he has one dependent, or at the rate of \$160 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(2) If such program is pursued on a three-quarters time basis, such allowance shall be computed at the rate of \$80 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of \$100 per month, if he has one dependent, or at the rate of \$120 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(3) If such program is pursued on a half-time basis, such allowance shall be computed at the rate of \$50 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of \$60 per month, if he has one dependent, or at the rate of \$80 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(b) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a full-time program of education and training which consists of institutional courses and on-the-job training, with the on-the-job training portion of the program being strictly supplemental to the institutional portion, shall be computed at the rate of (1) \$90 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) \$110 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) \$130 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(c) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing apprenticeship or other training on the job shall be computed at the rate of (1) \$70 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) \$85 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) \$105 per month, if he has more than one dependent; except that his education and training allowance shall be reduced at the end of each four-month period as his program progresses by an amount which bears the same ratio to the basic education and training allowance as four months bears to the total duration of his apprenticeship or other training on the job; but in no case shall the Administrator pay an education and training allowance under this subsection in an amount which, when added to the compensation to be paid to the veteran, in accordance with his approved training program, for productive labor performed as a part of his course, would exceed the rate of \$310 per month. For the purpose of computing allowances under this subsection, the duration of the training of an eligible veteran shall be the period specified in the approved application as the period during which he may receive an education and training allowance for such training, plus such additional period, if any, as is necessary to make the number of months of such training a multiple of four.

"(d) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing institutional on-farm training shall be computed at the rate of (1) \$95 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) \$110 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) \$130 per month, if he has more than one dependent; except that his education and training allowance shall be reduced at the end of the third, and each subsequent, four-month period as his program progresses by an amount which bears the same ratio to \$65 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or \$80 per month, if he has one dependent, or \$100 per month, if he has more than one dependent, as four months bears to the total duration of such veteran's institutional on-farm training reduced by eight months. For the purpose of computing allowances under this subsection, the duration of the training of an eligible veteran shall be the period specified in the approved application as the period during which he may receive an education and training allowance for such training, plus such

additional period, if any, as is necessary to make the number of such months of such training a multiple of four.

"(e) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing a program of education or training exclusively by correspondence shall be computed on the basis of the established charge which the institution requires nonveterans to pay for the course or courses pursued by the eligible veteran. Such allowance shall be paid quarterly on a pro rata basis for the lessons completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution, as certified by the institution.

"(f) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training under this chapter in an educational institution on a less-than-half-time basis shall be computed at the rate of (1) the established charges for tuition and fees which the institution requires similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same course to pay, or (2) \$110 per month for a full-time course, whichever is the lesser.

"(g) Each eligible veteran who is pursuing an approved course of flight training shall be paid an education and training allowance to be computed at the rate of 75 per centum of the established charge which similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same flight course are required to pay for tuition for the course. If such veteran's program of education or training consists exclusively of flight training, he shall not be paid an education and training allowance under one of the preceding subsections of this section; if his program of education or training consists of flight training and other education or training, the allowance payable under this subsection shall be in addition to any education and training allowance payable to him under one of the preceding subsections of this section for education or training other than flight training. Such allowance shall be paid monthly upon receipt of certification from the eligible veteran and the institution as to the actual flight training received by the veteran. In each such case the eligible veteran's period of entitlement shall be charged (in addition to any charge made against his entitlement by reason of education or training other than flight training) with one day for each \$1.25 which is paid to the veteran as an education and training allowance for such course.

"(h) No eligible veteran shall be paid an education and training allowance under this chapter for any period during which (1) he is enrolled in and pursuing a course of education or training paid for by the United States under any provision of law other than this chapter, where the payment of such allowance would constitute a duplication of benefits paid to the veteran from the Federal Treasury, or (2) he is pursuing a course of apprenticeship or other training on the job, a course of institutional on-farm training, or a course of education and training described in subsection (b) on a less than full-time basis.

"§ 1933. Measurement of courses

"(a) For the purposes of this chapter (1) an institutional trade or technical course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level involving shop practice as an integral part thereof, shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of thirty hours per week of attendance is required with not more than two and one-half hours of rest periods per week allowed, (2) an institutional course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level in which theoretical or classroom instruction predominates shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of twenty-five hours per week net of instruction is required, and (3) an institutional undergraduate course offered by a college or university on a quarter or semester-hour basis for which credit is granted toward a

standard college degree shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of fourteen semester hours or its equivalent is required.

"(b) The Administrator shall define full-time training in the case of all types of courses of education or training other than institutional on-farm training and the types of courses referred to in subsection (a); except that, the Administrator shall not define full-time apprentice training for a particular establishment other than that established as the standard workweek through bona fide collective bargaining between employers and employees.

"§ 1934. Overcharges by educational institutions

"The Administrator may, if he finds that an institution has charged or received from any eligible veteran any amount in excess of the established charges for tuition and fees which the institution requires similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same course to pay, disapprove such educational institution for the enrollment of any veteran not already enrolled therein, except that, in the case of a tax-supported public educational institution which does not have established charges for tuition and fees which it requires nonveteran residents to pay, such institution may charge and receive from each eligible veteran who is a resident an amount equal to the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction attributable to such veteran, but in no event to exceed the rate of \$10 per month for a full-time course. Any educational institution or training establishment disapproved under this section shall also be disapproved for the enrollment of any veteran not already enrolled therein under chapter 31, or for the enrollment of any eligible person not already enrolled therein under chapter 35.

"Subchapter V—State approving agencies

"§ 1941. Designation

"(a) Unless otherwise established by the law of the State concerned, the chief executive of each State is requested to create or designate a State department or agency as the 'State approving agency' for his State for the purposes of this chapter.

"(b) (1) If any State fails or declines to create or designate a State approving agency, the provisions of this chapter which refer to the State approving agency shall, with respect to such State, be deemed to refer to the Administrator.

"(2) In the case of courses subject to approval by the Administrator under section 1942 of this title, the provisions of this chapter which refer to a State approving agency shall be deemed to refer to the Administrator.

"§ 1942. Approval of courses

"(a) An eligible veteran shall receive the benefits of this chapter while enrolled in a course of education or training offered by an educational institution or training establishment only if such course is approved by the State approving agency for the State where such educational institution or training establishment is situated or by the Administrator. Approval of courses by State approving agencies shall be in accordance with the provisions of this chapter and such other regulations and policies as the State approving agency may adopt. Each State approving agency shall furnish the Administration with a current list of educational institutions and training establishments, specifying courses which it has approved, and, in addition to such list, it shall furnish such other information to the Administrator as it and the Administrator may determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter. Each State approving agency shall notify the Administrator of the disapproval of any course previously approved and shall set forth the reasons for such disapproval.

"(b) The Administrator shall be responsible for the approval of courses of education or training offered by any agency of the Federal Government authorized under other laws to supervise such education or training. The Administrator may approve any course in any other educational institution or training establishment in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

"§ 1943. Cooperation

"(a) The Administrator and each State approving agency shall take cognizance of the fact that definite duties, functions, and responsibilities are conferred upon the Administrator and each State approving agency under the veterans' educational programs. To assure that such programs are effectively and efficiently administered, the cooperation of the Administrator and the State approving agencies is essential. It is necessary to establish an exchange of information pertaining to activities of educational institutions and training establishments, and particular attention should be given to the enforcement of approval standards, enforcement of wage and income limitations, enforcement of enrollment restrictions, and fraudulent and other criminal activities on the part of persons connected with educational institutions and training establishments in which veterans are enrolled under this chapter.

"(b) The Administrator will furnish the State approving agencies with copies of such Veterans' Administration informational material as may aid them in carrying out this chapter.

"§ 1944. Use of Office of Education and other Federal agencies

"(a) In carrying out his functions under this chapter, the Administrator may utilize the facilities and services of any other Federal department or agency. The Administrator shall utilize the services of the Office of Education in developing cooperative agreements between the Administrator and State and local agencies relating to the approval of courses of education or training as provided for in section 1945 of this title, in reviewing the plan of operations of State approving agencies under such agreements, and in rendering technical assistance to such State and local agencies in developing and improving policies, standards, and legislation in connection with their duties under this chapter.

"(b) Any such utilization shall be pursuant to proper agreement with the Federal department or agency concerned; and payment to cover the cost thereof shall (except in the case of the Office of Education) be made either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be provided in such agreement. Funds necessary to enable the Office of Education to carry out its functions under this chapter are authorized to be appropriated directly to such Office.

"§ 1945. Reimbursement of expenses

"The Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts or agreements with State and local agencies to pay such State and local agencies for reasonable and necessary expenses of salary and travel incurred by employees of such agencies in (1) rendering necessary services in ascertaining the qualifications of educational institutions and training establishments for furnishing courses of education or training to eligible veterans under this chapter, and in the supervision of such educational institutions and training establishments, and (2) furnishing, at the request of the Administrator, any other services in connection with this chapter. Each such contract or agreement shall be conditioned upon compliance with the standards and provisions of this chapter.

"Subchapter VI—Approval of courses of education and training

"§ 1951. Apprentice or other training on the job

"(a) Apprentice or other training on the job shall consist of courses offered by training establishments whenever such courses of training are furnished in accordance with the provisions of this section. Any training establishment desiring to furnish a course of apprentice or other training on the job shall submit to the appropriate State approving agency a written application setting forth the course of training for each job for which an eligible veteran is to be trained. The written application covering the course of training shall include the following:

"(1) Title and description of the specific job objective for which the eligible veteran is to be trained;

"(2) The length of the training period;

"(3) A schedule listing various operations for major kinds of work or tasks to be learned and showing for each, job operations or work, tasks to be performed, and the approximate length of time to be spent on each operation or task;

"(4) The wage or salary to be paid at the beginning of the course of training, at each successive step in the course, and at the completion of training;

"(5) The entrance wage or salary paid by the establishment to employees already trained in the kind of work for which the veteran is to be trained; and

"(6) The number of hours of supplemental related instruction required.

"(b) The appropriate State approving agency may approve a course of apprentice or other training on the job specified in an application submitted by a training establishment in accordance with subsection (a) if such training establishment is found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

"(1) The training content of the course is adequate to qualify the eligible veteran for appointment to the job for which he is to be trained.

"(2) There is reasonable certainty that the job for which the eligible veteran is to be trained will be available to him at the end of the training period.

"(3) The job is one in which progression and appointment to the next higher classification are based upon skills learned through organized training on the job and not on such factors as length of service and normal turnover.

"(4) The wages to be paid the eligible veteran for each successive period of training are not less than those customarily paid in the training establishment and in the community to a learner in the same job who is not a veteran.

"(5) The job customarily requires a period of training of not less than three months and not more than two years of full-time training, except that this provision shall not apply to apprentice training.

"(6) The length of the training period is no longer than that customarily required by the training establishment and other training establishments in the community to provide an eligible veteran with the required skills, arrange for the acquiring of job knowledge, technical information, and other facts which the eligible veteran will need to learn in order to become competent on the job for which he is being trained.

"(7) Provision is made for related instruction for the individual eligible veteran who may need it.

"(8) There is in the training establishment adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide satisfactory training on the job.

"(9) Adequate records are kept to show the progress made by each eligible veteran toward his job objective.

"(10) Appropriate credit is given the eligible veteran for previous training and job experience, whether in the military service or elsewhere, his beginning wage adjusted to the level to which such credit advances

him, and his training period shortened accordingly, and provision is made for certification by the training establishment that such credit has been granted and the beginning wage adjusted accordingly. No course of training will be considered bona fide if given to an eligible veteran who is already qualified by training and experience for the job objective.

"(11) A signed copy of the training agreement for each eligible veteran, including the training program and wage scale as approved by the State approving agency, is provided to the veteran and to the Administrator and the State approving agency by the employer.

"(12) Upon completion of the course of training furnished by the training establishment the eligible veteran is given a certificate by the employer indicating the length and type of training provided and that the eligible veteran has completed the course of training on the job satisfactorily.

"(13) That the course meets such other criteria as may be established by the State approving agency.

"§ 1952. Institutional on-farm training

"(a) An eligible veteran shall be entitled to the benefits of this chapter while enrolled in a course of full-time institutional on-farm training which has been approved by the appropriate State approving agency in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(b) The State approving agency may approve a course of institutional on-farm training when it satisfies the following requirements:

"(1) The course combines organized group instruction in agricultural and related subjects of at least two hundred hours per year (and of at least eight hours each month) at an educational institution, with supervised work experience on a farm or other agricultural establishment.

"(2) The eligible veteran will perform a part of such course on a farm or other agricultural establishment under his control.

"(3) The course is developed with due consideration to the size and character of the farm or other agricultural establishment on which the eligible veteran will receive his supervised work experience and to the need of such eligible veteran, in the type of farming for which he is training, for proficiency in planning, producing, marketing, farm mechanics, conservation of resources, food conservation, farm financing, farming management, and the keeping of farm and home accounts.

"(4) The eligible veteran will receive not less than one hundred hours of individual instruction per year, not less than fifty hours of which shall be on such farm or other agricultural establishment (with at least two visits by the instructor to such farm each month). Such individual instruction shall be given by the instructor responsible for the veteran's institutional instruction and shall include instruction and home-study assignments in the preparation of budgets, inventories, and statements showing the production, use on the farm, and sale of crops, livestock, and livestock products.

"(5) The eligible veteran will be assured of control of such farm or other agricultural establishment (whether by ownership, lease, management, agreement, or other tenure arrangement) until the completion of his course.

"(6) Such farm or other agricultural establishment shall be of a size and character which (A) will, together with the group-instruction part of the course, occupy the full time of the eligible veteran, (B) will permit instruction in all aspects of the management of the farm or other agricultural establishment of the type for which the eligible veteran is being trained, and will provide the eligible veteran an opportunity to apply to the operation of his farm or other agricultural

establishment the major portion of the farm practices taught in the group-instruction part of the course, and (C) will assure him a satisfactory income for a reasonable living under normal conditions at least by the end of his course.

"(7) Provision shall be made for certification by the institution and the veteran that the training offered does not repeat or duplicate training previously received by the veteran.

"(8) The institutional on-farm training meets such other fair and reasonable standards as may be established by the State approving agency.

"§ 1953. Approval of accredited courses

"(a) A State approving agency may approve the courses offered by an educational institution when—

"(1) such courses have been accredited and approved by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association;

"(2) credit for such course is approved by the State department of education for credit toward a high school diploma;

"(3) such courses are conducted under sections 11-28 of title 20; or

"(4) such courses are accepted by the State department of education for credit for a teacher's certificate or a teacher's degree.

For the purposes of this chapter the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies and associations which he determines to be a reliable authority as to the quality of training offered by an educational institution and the State approving agencies may, upon concurrence, utilize the accreditation of such accrediting associations or agencies for approval of the courses specifically accredited and approved by such accrediting association or agency. In making application for approval, the institution shall transmit to the State approving agency copies of its catalog or bulletin.

"(b) As a condition to approval under this section, the State approving agency must find that adequate records are kept by the educational institution to show the progress of each eligible veteran. The State approving agency must also find that the educational institution maintains a written record of the previous education and training of the veteran and clearly indicates that appropriate credit has been given by the institution for previous education and training, with the training period shortened proportionately and the veteran and the Administrator so notified.

"§ 1954. Approval of nonaccredited courses

"(a) No course of education or training (other than a course of institutional on-farm training) which has not been approved by a State approving agency pursuant to section 1953 of this title, which is offered by a public or private, profit or nonprofit, educational institution shall be approved for the purposes of this chapter unless the educational institution offering such course submits to the appropriate State approving agency a written application for approval of such course in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

"(b) Such application shall be accompanied by not less than two copies of the current catalog or bulletin which is certified as true and correct in content and policy by an authorized owner or official and includes the following:

"(1) Identifying data, such as volume number and date of publication;

"(2) Names of the institution and its governing body, officials and faculty;

"(3) A calendar of the institution showing legal holidays, beginning and ending date of each quarter, term, or semester, and other important dates;

"(4) Institution policy and regulations on enrollment with respect to enrollment dates

and specific entrance requirements for each course;

"(5) Institution policy and regulations relative to leave, absences, class cuts, make-up work, tardiness and interruptions for unsatisfactory attendance;

"(6) Institution policy and regulations relative to standards of progress required of the student by the institution (this policy will define the grading system of the institution, the minimum grades considered satisfactory, conditions for interruption for unsatisfactory grades or progress and a description of the probationary period, if any, allowed by the institution, and conditions of reentrance for those students dismissed for unsatisfactory progress. A statement will be made regarding progress records kept by the institution and furnished the student);

"(7) Institution policy and regulations relating to student conduct and conditions for dismissal for unsatisfactory conduct;

"(8) Detailed schedules of fees, charges for tuition, books, supplies, tools, student activities, laboratory fees, service charges, rentals, deposits, and all other charges;

"(9) Policy and regulations of the institution relative to the refund of the unused portion of tuition, fees, and other charges in the event the student does not enter the course or withdraws or is discontinued therefrom;

"(10) A description of the available space, facilities, and equipment;

"(11) A course outline for each course for which approval is requested, showing subjects or units in the course, type of work or skill to be learned, and approximate time and clock hours to be spent on each subject or unit; and

"(12) Policy and regulations of the institution relative to granting credit for previous educational training.

"(c) The appropriate State approving agency may approve the application of such institution when the institution and its non-accredited courses are found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

"(1) The courses, curriculum, and instruction are consistent with quality, content, and length with similar courses in public schools and other private schools in the State, with recognized accepted standards.

"(2) There is in the institution adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide training of good quality.

"(3) Educational and experience qualifications of directors, administrators, and instructors are adequate.

"(4) The institution maintains a written record of the previous education and training of the veteran and clearly indicates that appropriate credit has been given by the institution for previous education and training, with the training period shortened proportionately and the veteran and the Administrator so notified.

"(5) A copy of the course outline, schedule of tuition, fees, and other charges, regulations pertaining to absence, grading policy, and rules of operation and conduct will be furnished the veteran upon enrollment.

"(6) Upon completion of training, the veteran is given a certificate by the institution indicating the approved course and indicating that training was satisfactorily completed.

"(7) Adequate records as prescribed by the State approving agency are kept to show attendance and progress or grades, and satisfactory standards relating to attendance, progress, and conduct are enforced.

"(8) The institution complies with all local, city, county, municipal, State, and Federal regulations, such as fire codes, building and sanitation codes. The State ap-

proving agency may require such evidence of compliance as is deemed necessary.

"(9) The institution is financially sound and capable of fulfilling its commitments for training.

"(10) The institution does not utilize advertising of any type which is erroneous or misleading, either by actual statement, omission, or intimation. The institution shall not be deemed to have met this requirement until the State approving agency (A) has ascertained from the Federal Trade Commission whether the Commission has issued an order to the institution to cease and desist from any act or practice, and (B) has, if such an order has been issued, given due weight to that fact.

"(11) The institution does not exceed its enrollment limitations as established by the State approving agency.

"(12) The institution's administrators, directors, owners, and instructors are of good reputation and character.

"(13) The institution has and maintains a policy for the refund of the unused portion of tuition, fees, and other charges in the event the veteran fails to enter the course or withdraws or is discontinued therefrom at any time prior to completion and such policy must provide that the amount charged to the veteran for tuition, fees, and other charges for a portion of the course shall not exceed the approximate pro rata portion of the total charges for tuition, fees, and other charges that the length of the completed portion of the course bears to its total length.

"(14) Such additional criteria as may be deemed necessary by the State approving agency.

"§ 1955. Notice of approval of courses

"The State approving agency, upon determining that an educational institution has complied with all the requirements of this chapter, will issue a letter to such institution setting forth the courses which have been approved for the purposes of this chapter, and will furnish an official copy of such letter and any subsequent amendments to the Administrator. The letter of approval shall be accompanied by a copy of the catalog or bulletin of the institution, as approved by the State approving agency, and shall contain the following information:

"(1) date of letter and effective date of approval of courses;

"(2) proper address and name of each educational institution or training establishment;

"(3) authority for approval and conditions of approval, referring specifically to the approved catalog or bulletin published by the educational institution;

"(4) name of each course approved;

"(5) where applicable, enrollment limitations such as maximum numbers authorized and student-teacher ratio;

"(6) signature of responsible official of State approving agency; and

"(7) such other fair and reasonable provisions as are considered necessary by the appropriate State approving agency.

"§ 1956. Disapproval of courses and discontinuance of allowances

"(a) Any course approved for the purposes of this chapter which fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter shall be immediately disapproved by the appropriate State approving agency. An educational institution or training establishment which has its courses disapproved by a State approving agency will be notified of such disapproval by a certified or registered letter of notification and a return receipt secured.

"(b) The Administrator may discontinue the education and training allowance of any eligible veteran if he finds that the course of education or training in which such veteran is enrolled fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter or if he finds that the educational institution or training establish-

ment offering such course has violated any provisions of this chapter or fails to meet any of its requirements.

"(c) Each State approving agency shall notify the Administrator of each course which it has disapproved under this section.

"Subchapter VII—Miscellaneous provisions

"§ 1961. Authority and duties of Administrator

"Payments under this chapter shall be subject to audit and review by the General Accounting Office as provided by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 and the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950.

"§ 1962. Educational and vocational counseling

"The Administrator may arrange for educational and vocational counseling to persons eligible for education and training under this chapter. At such intervals as he deems necessary, he shall make available information respecting the need for general education and for trained personnel in the various crafts, trades, and professions. Facilities of other Federal agencies collecting such information shall be utilized to the extent he deems practicable.

"§ 1963. Control by agencies of United States

"No department, agency, or officer of the United States, in carrying out this chapter, shall exercise any supervision or control, whatsoever, over any State approving agency, State educational agency, or State apprenticeship agency, or any educational institution or training establishment. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prevent any department, agency, or officer of the United States from exercising any supervision or control which such department, agency, or officer is authorized by law to exercise over any Federal educational institution or training establishment, or to prevent the furnishing of education or training under this chapter in any institution or establishment over which supervision or control is exercised by such other department, agency, or officer under authority of existing provisions of law.

"§ 1964. Conflicting interests

"(a) Every officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, or of the Office of Education, who has, while such an officer or employee, owned any interest in, or received any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, any educational institution operated for profit in which an eligible veteran was pursuing a course of education or training under this chapter shall be immediately dismissed from his office or employment.

"(b) If the Administrator finds that any person who is an officer or employee of a State approving agency has, while he was such an officer or employee, owned any interest in, or received any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, an educational institution operated for profit in which an eligible veteran was pursuing a course of education or training under this chapter, he shall discontinue making payments under section 1945 of this title to such State approving agency unless such agency shall, without delay, take such steps as may be necessary to terminate the employment of such person and such payments shall not be resumed while such person is an officer or employee of the State approving agency, or State department of veterans affairs or State department of education.

"(c) A State approving agency shall not approve any course offered by an educational institution operated for profit and, if any such course has been approved, shall disapprove each such course, if it finds that any officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, the Office of Education, or the State approving agency owns an interest in, or receives any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, such institution.

"(d) The Administrator may, after reasonable notice and public hearings, waive in writing the application of this section in the case of any officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, of the Office of Education, or of a State approving agency, if he finds that no detriment will result to the United States or to eligible veterans by reason of such interest or connection of such officer or employee.

"§ 1965. Reports by institutions

"(a) Educational institutions and training establishments shall, without delay, report to the Administrator in the form prescribed by him, the enrollment, interruption, and termination of the education or training of each eligible veteran enrolled therein under this chapter.

"(b) The Administrator shall pay to each educational institution which is required to submit reports and certifications to the Administrator under this chapter, an allowance at the rate of \$1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution under the provisions of this chapter to assist the educational institution in defraying the expense of preparing and submitting such reports and certifications. Such allowances shall be paid in such manner and at such times as may be prescribed by the Administrator, except that if any institution fails to submit reports or certifications to the Administrator as required by this chapter, no allowance shall be paid to such institution for the month or months during which such reports or certifications were not submitted as required by the Administrator.

"§ 1966. Overpayments to veterans

"Whenever the Administrator finds that an overpayment has been made to a veteran as the result of (1) the willful or negligent failure of the educational institution or training establishment to report as required by this chapter and applicable regulations, to the Veterans' Administration excessive absences from a course, or discontinuance or interruption of a course by the veteran or (2) false certification by the educational institution or training establishment, the amount of such overpayment shall constitute a liability of such institution or establishment, and may be recovered in the same manner as any other debt due the United States. Any amount so collected shall be reimbursed if the overpayment is recovered from the veteran. This section shall not preclude the imposition of any civil or criminal liability under this or any other law.

"§ 1967. Examination of records

"The records and accounts of educational institutions and training establishments pertaining to eligible veterans who received education or training under this chapter shall be available for examination by duly authorized representatives of the Government.

"§ 1968. False or misleading statements

"In each case where the Administrator finds that an educational institution or training establishment has willfully submitted a false or misleading claim, or where a veteran, with the complicity of an educational institution or training establishment, has submitted such a claim, he shall make a complete report of the facts of the case to the appropriate State approving agency and where deemed advisable to the Attorney General of the United States for appropriate action.

"§ 1969. Information furnished by Federal Trade Commission

"The Federal Trade Commission shall keep all State approving agencies advised of any information coming to its attention which would be of assistance to such agencies in carrying out their duties under this chapter.

"§ 1970. Effective date and retroactive allowances

"The provisions of this chapter shall take effect as of January 1, 1965. In the event this chapter is enacted subsequent to such date, the Administrator shall prescribe regulations for making retroactive payments of education and training allowances, upon application therefor, to eligible veterans for education or training pursued by them on or after January 1, 1965, and prior to the date of the enactment of this chapter."

(b) The table of contents at the beginning of such title is amended by inserting immediately after

"39. Automobiles for Disabled Veterans..... 1091"
the following:

"40. Education of Veterans Who Serve in the Southeast Asia Theater of Operations..... 1908".

(c) The table of chapters at the beginning of part III of such title is amended by inserting immediately after

"39. Automobiles for Disabled Veterans..... 1901"
the following:

"40. Education of Veterans Who Serve in the Southeast Asia Theater of Operations..... 1908".

(d) Such title is further amended—

(1) by inserting in section 102(a) (2) immediately after "chapter 33" the following: "or 40", and by striking out "chapters 19 and 33" in section 102(b), and inserting in lieu thereof "chapters 19, 33, and 40";

(2) by striking out in section 111(a) "33 or 35", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "33, 35, or 40";

(3) by inserting in section 211(a) after "1761," the following: "1961,";

(4) by striking out in section 1662(b) "chapters 31 and 35" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "chapters 31, 35, and 40";

(5) by striking out in section 1711(b) "chapter 31 or 33", and inserting in lieu thereof the following "chapter 31, 33, or 40";

(6) by striking out in section 1734(a) "chapter 31 or 33" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "chapter 31, 33, or 40";

(7) by striking out in section 3013 "and 35" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "35, and 40";

(8) by inserting after "chapter 35" in section 1611(a) (2) the following "or education or training under chapter 40"; and

(9) by inserting in section 1634 immediately before the comma following "therein" the following: "under this chapter or chapter 40".

Sec. 3. (a) Chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of section 1801(a) the following new paragraphs:

"(3) The term 'basic service period' means the period beginning on January 1, 1961, and ending on such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress.

"(4) The term 'southeast Asia theater of operations' means any area in southeast Asia in which armed conflict or warlike conditions exist as determined by the President. The geographic description of any such area shall be prescribed by the President from time to time by Executive order. Any change in the geographic limits of any such area by the President shall not affect the eligibility of any veteran who qualified for benefits under this title prior to such change."

(b) Chapter 37 of such title is further amended by inserting immediately after section 1817 the following new section:

"§ 1818. Veterans who serve in the southeast Asia theater of operations

"(a) Each veteran who served on active duty in the southeast Asia theater of operations at any time during the basic service

period, shall be eligible for the benefits of this chapter (except sections 1813 and 1815, and business loans under section 1814, of this title), subject to the provisions of this section, if his total service was for a period of more than one hundred and eighty days, or if he was discharged or released from a period of active duty, any part of which was performed in the southeast Asia theater of operations during the basic service period, for a service-connected disability.

"(b) No veteran shall be eligible for benefits under this section so long as he is eligible under this chapter for any unused benefits derived from service during World War II or the Korean conflict. Any veteran who is eligible for benefits under this section and who has obtained benefits under this chapter by reason of service during World War II or the Korean conflict shall have his benefits under this section reduced by the amount of any benefits previously obtained under this chapter. Benefits shall not be afforded under this section to any individual on account of service as a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, or the Regular or Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service.

"(c) Loans may be guaranteed under this section if made before the expiration of ten years after the date of discharge or release of the veteran from a period of active duty or any part of which was performed in the southeast Asia theater of operations during the basic service period. If a loan report or application for loan guaranty is received by the Administrator before the expiration of the ten-year period, not to exceed one year will be allowed in addition for the disbursement of the loan and issuance of evidence of guaranty. Direct loans authorized by this section shall not be made after the expiration of ten years after the date of discharge or release of the veteran from a period of active duty any part of which was performed in the southeast Asia theater of operations during the basic service period, except pursuant to commitments issued by the Administrator on or before that date.

"(d) A fee shall be collected from each veteran obtaining a loan guaranteed or made under this section, and no loan shall be guaranteed or made under this section until the fee payable with respect to such loan has been collected and remitted to the Administrator. The amount of the fee shall be established from time to time by the Administrator, but shall in no event exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the total loan amount. The amount of the fee may be included in the loan to the veteran and paid from the proceeds thereof. The administrator shall deposit all fees collected hereunder in the revolving fund established under the provisions of section 1824 of this title."

(e) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 37 of such title is amended by inserting immediately below

"1817. Release from liability under guaranty."

the following:

"1818. Veterans who serve in the southeast Asia theater of operations."

(d) Section 1822(a) of such title is amended by striking out "or 1813", and inserting in lieu thereof "1813, or 1818".

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, if Senators will give me their attention for a few minutes, I do not intend to take very long to explain the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

First, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, in view of the vote on the last amendment, I believe that we can consider the sub-

stitute amendment quickly. However, there are some provisions in it which avoid some of the problems contained in the previous amendment. I shall speak for approximately 5 minutes, if Senators will remain in the Chamber, and then we can vote.

I am sorry that the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts did not prevail, because all the arguments offered in support of his amendment apply equally to my amendment in the nature of a substitute.

There is still one important consideration which we must take into account, and it seems to me it should be reemphasized. If we are to obtain any GI bill benefits for our servicemen, we must modify the omnibus cold war bill proposed by the Senator from Texas, which is opposed, as everyone knows, not only by the President but also by the Defense Department, Veterans' Administration, Bureau of the Budget, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and a number of other veterans organizations.

Yet, for some reason wholly unknown to me, it seems to be sailing through the Senate. It is not going to be sailing through the House. It is not going to get anywhere. Accordingly, if we are to try to do something for our servicemen, we had better take the opportunity to do so in the context which I believe makes sense.

What is this context?

Now that the war in South Vietnam is becoming enlarged, we must provide benefits for veterans who have service-connected disabilities in that area, or who have served there for 6 months or more.

My amendment in the nature of a substitute is a simple one. It would provide that educational and readjustment benefits be paid to veterans serving in South Vietnam. I believe that all Senators will agree with me that the war there is escalating, going up and up and up. The Defense Department and the Veterans' Administration both assert that what we need is some incentive for a veteran engaged in hostilities and not for a veteran of peacetime service. Here is one area that we can do it.

One of the arguments made against the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts was the question that it might be diplomatically embarrassing for the President to declare what areas were or were not areas of hostility. My amendment in the nature of a substitute would avoid that. It would merely provide that the southeastern Asian theater is the area where our Armed Forces are serving, and if they are entitled to these benefits, it would completely avoid the embarrassment which was said to be evident so far as what is and what is not an area of hostility is concerned. It also would provide readjustment assistance for veterans of the southeast Asia theater who performed active duty between January 1, 1961, and the termination date of the draft law, which is July 1, 1967. The 1961 beginning date was selected because that marks the beginning of our real buildup in southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I should explain in more detail the educational and vocational training assistance which the Vietnam GI bill would provide. Briefly, it is this: Eligibility for educational benefits is conditioned upon more than 6 months of active duty, or upon discharge for service-connected disability. The educational period could not exceed 36 months, and would be computed on the basis of 1½ days of benefit for each day of active duty.

During the educational period, monthly benefit allowances would be \$110 for full-time college attendance by a veteran with no dependents; \$135 for a veteran with one dependent; and \$160 for a veteran with more than one dependent—in other words, practically the same as the pending bill.

It is also worthwhile reporting to the Senate that children of combat dead are eligible for the educational benefits which would have accrued to the father.

I note here that to estimate the amount of benefits granted under the amendment would be difficult. I believe the Senator from Texas has estimated that it would cost \$1,900 million. Let me inquire of the Senator if that is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I made no estimate. Such an estimate was made by opponents of the bill.

Mr. DOMINICK. It is in excess of \$1½ billion, in any event, for the first year. The estimate in my substitute amendment is approximately \$400 million, which is still a great deal of money. Therefore, we are not dealing with something which would be simple to adopt, one way or another. There is a great distinction between the amount of the bill and the amount the Senator from Texas is proposing to spend. We are, in this case, taking care of those who actually serve in the area, where the most danger accrues to a serviceman.

I repeat, because many Senators who are now in the Chamber were not previously on the floor, that the pending bill has been based on the theory that Uncle Sam's icy finger is raised and points to some young man or woman and says, "You are in the service whether you like it or not."

Mr. President, out of 2,600,000 young men and women in our armed services, less than 10 percent are draftees. Therefore, what we are in effect saying is that if we should enact the bill introduced by the Senator from Texas, it would mean we were to give everyone—even though they enlisted in the services—exactly the same treatment as we are the draftees. That does not seem to me to make logical sense.

Second, the veterans organizations, the Defense Department, and the President has said it, too, let me emphasize, that we should be trying to reach the veterans who serve in areas of hostility, and that we should not expand it to general, peacetime services.

Third, on the subject of education, veterans would receive an education when they get out of the service. We have before the Education Subcommittee of the Labor and Welfare Committee at the present time a higher education bill which will vastly increase the Na-

tional Defense Education Act funds on a loan basis and on a grant basis. It is now in executive markup to go forward at this time. To superimpose a whole new system of education on top of the one we have now does not seem realistic. That is why the bill was not reported at the time of the secondary education bill.

We debated the language we have now before us even before we worked on the higher education bill.

I hold in my hand an estimate of the educational allowances in section 2 of S. 9. It indicates, for the first 5 years, \$1,933 million—from page 20 of the report.

Mr. President, I do not believe that I need to speak much longer on this subject. There has been a good deal of debate already on Vietnam and the wisdom of the policy which the United States has been pursuing. A number of persons are saying that we did not think it should be followed through in the way that it is going.

Several of us believe that perhaps we should give more active consideration to the areas that ought to be hit, and the question of bombing; and that we should also try to avoid a ground war in Asia, if possible.

However, no matter what our position may be on this particular aspect of policy, not one of us fails to recognize the fact that the servicemen over there are in an active perilous position. It is perilous to them. It could be disastrous for their families.

It seems to me that this is the type of thing we ought to consider.

Therefore I offer the amendment on behalf of myself and Senator Tower, Senator ALLOTT, and all the other Senators who sponsored S. 458 as it was originally presented to the Senate. They include Senators BARTLETT, CURTIS, FANNIN, MUNDT, MURPHY, RANDOLPH, PEARSON, and, I am sure, a number of other Senators; also the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Most of the points have been argued already, but, for the sake of reaffirmation and emphasis, this type of proposal, I am sure, would gain the support of the Defense Department, the Veterans' Administration, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The present bill does not have the support of any of those organizations; nor of the President of the United States, nor of the previous President of the United States; nor of President Eisenhower.

This substitute is an amendment for which all of us can vote with considerable confidence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a number of Senators have asked me when the Senate would vote on the amendment. I expect to make my remarks very brief. I hope they will not exceed 2 minutes in time.

In this first place, the amendment we have defeated, the one that had been offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, was fairer to the veterans than

the present amendment. The present amendment is much more restrictive than the amendment which has just been rejected. The Senator from Massachusetts agreed with the Senator from New York that Berlin, the Caribbean, and the Dominican Republic were areas of conflict that he thought should be declared areas of hostility.

Under the proposed amendment, the only place that would be considered an area of hostility would be southeast Asia. The amendment practically takes the bill apart. It makes it apply to less than 10 percent of those who are in the armed services. Therefore, having defeated the former amendment, which was a much fairer amendment than the present one, I hope that the Senate will also defeat the present amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. The amendment applies to southeast Asia, and makes that a combat area, not the Dominican Republic.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Senator who preceded the Senator from Colorado stated that the Dominican Republic would be a fair place to which to apply the bill.

My point is that the amendment would be limited to South Vietnam. It could not be applied to the Dominican Republic or any other area. It could not be applied to Berlin, and other areas no matter how dangerous the service may be in other areas of the world. No consideration would be given to persons who serve in other areas, no matter how dangerous they might be.

On the question of the President being opposed, I have no doubt that if the bill were passed, the President would sign it. When the distinguished President served as our majority leader in 1959, he voted for a similar bill. I have before me vote No. 130, of July 31, 1959. That bill was passed by a vote of 57 to 31. Not only did the then majority leader vote for the bill, but he helped us get that big majority behind that vote so that we could pass it by a vote of 57 to 31. He offered invaluable suggestions to us. I have no doubt that if the bill were passed it would be approved by him.

I have discussed the bill with him several times but I shall not reveal the conversations that I had with him on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from

Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay," and the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 53, as follows:

[No. 190 Leg.]

YEAS—31

Allott	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bennett	Holland	Scott
Boggs	Hruska	Simpson
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Smathers
Cooper	Lausche	Stennis
Cotton	Morton	Thurmond
Curtis	Mundt	Tower
Dirksen	Murphy	Williams, Del.
Dominick	Pearson	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Prouty	
Fannin	Robertson	

NAYS—53

Aiken	Hart	Mondale
Anderson	Hartke	Montoya
Bartlett	Hill	Morse
Bass	Inouye	Moss
Bayh	Jackson	Muskie
Bible	Kennedy, Mass.	Nelson
Burdick	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Kuchel	Proxmire
Cannon	Long, Mo.	Russell, Ga.
Case	Long, La.	Russell, S.C.
Church	Magnuson	Smith
Clark	Mansfield	Symington
Dodd	McCarthy	Talmadge
Fong	McClellan	Tydings
Fulbright	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Gore	McGovern	Yarborough
Gruening	McIntyre	Young, Ohio
Harris	McNamara	

NOT VOTING—16

Brewster	Javits	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Douglas	Metcalfe	Ribicoff
Eastland	Miller	Sparkman
Ervin	Monroney	
Hayden	Neuberger	

So Mr. DOMINICK's amendment was rejected.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I call up my amendments No. 356 and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The amendments of the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendments.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments offered by Mr. COOPER are as follows:

On page 2, beginning with line 1, strike out all down through line 2 on page 50, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"CHAPTER 40—EDUCATION AND TRAINING LOANS

"Subchapter I—Definitions

"Sec.

"1908. Definitions.

"Subchapter II—Eligibility

"1910. Entitlement to education or training generally.

"1911. Computation of veteran's loan entitlement.

"1912. Commencement; time limitations.

"1913. Expiration of all education and training.

"Subchapter III—Enrollment

"1920. Selection of program.

"1921. Applications; approval.

"1922. Change of program.

"1923. Disapproval of enrollment in certain courses.

"1924. Discontinuance of education and training loans for unsatisfactory progress.

"1925. Period of operation for approval.

"1926. Institutions listed by Attorney General.

"Subchapter IV—Loans to veterans

"1931. Education and training loans.

"1932. Computation of education and training loan.

"1933. Loan requirements.

"1934. Actions to enforce repayment of loans.

"1935. Measurement of courses.

"1936. Overcharges by educational institutions.

"Subchapter V—State approving agencies

"1941. Designation.

"1942. Approval of courses.

"1943. Cooperation.

"1944. Use of Office of Education and other Federal agencies.

"1945. Reimbursement of expenses.

"Subchapter VI—Approval of courses of education and training

"1951. Apprentice or other training on the job.

"1952. Institutional on-farm training.

"1953. Approval of accredited courses.

"1954. Approval of nonaccredited courses.

"1955. Notice of approval of courses.

"1956. Disapproval of courses and discontinuance of allowances.

"Subchapter VII—Miscellaneous provisions

"1961. Authority and duties of Administrator.

"1962. Educational and vocational counseling.

"1963. Control by agencies of United States.

"1964. Conflicting interests.

"1965. Reports by institutions.

"1966. Overpayments to veterans.

"1967. Examination of records.

"1968. False or misleading statements.

"1969. Information furnished by Federal Trade Commission.

"1970. Effective date.

"Subchapter I—Definitions

"§ 1908. Definitions

"(a) For the purpose of this chapter—

"(1) The term 'eligible veteran' means any veteran who is not on active duty and who—

"(A) served on active duty at any time between January 1, 1955, and the day before the date of termination of compulsory military service under the laws of the United States,

"(B) was discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable, and was not given a bad-conduct discharge, or if an officer, did not resign for the good of the service, and

"(C) served on active duty for a period of one hundred and eighty days (exclusive of any period he was assigned by the Armed Forces to a civilian institution for a course of education or training which was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians, or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies), or was discharged or released from a period of active duty, any part of which occurred between January 31, 1955, and the day before the date of termination of compulsory military service under the laws of the United States, for an actual service-connected disability.

"(2) The term 'date of termination of compulsory military service under the laws of the United States' means the day following the last day on which involuntary induction of civilians (other than individuals liable for induction by reason of a prior deferment) into the Armed Forces of the United States is authorized under (A) the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as now in effect or hereafter amended, or (B) any law enacted after the date of enactment of this chapter, if such law is enacted within one hundred and eighty days after the Universal Military Training and Service Act ceases to be effective.

"(3) The term 'program of education or training' means any single unit course or subject, any curriculum, or any combination of unit courses or subjects, which is generally accepted as necessary to fulfill requirements for the attainment of a predetermined and identified educational, professional, or vocational objective.

"(4) The term 'course' means an organized unit of subject matter in which instruction is offered within a given period of time or which covers a specific amount of related subject matter for which credit toward graduation or certification is usually given.

"(5) The term 'dependent' means—

"(A) a child of an eligible veteran;

"(B) a parent of an eligible veteran, if the parent is in fact dependent upon the veteran; and

"(C) the wife of an eligible veteran, or, in the case of an eligible veteran who is a woman, her husband if he is in fact dependent upon her.

"(6) The term 'educational institution' means any public or private elementary school, secondary school, vocational school, correspondence school, business school, junior college, teachers college, college, normal

school, professional school, university, scientific or technical institution, or other institution furnishing education for adults.

"(7) The term 'training establishment' means any business or other establishment providing apprentice or other training on the job, including those under the supervision of a college or university or any State department of education, or any State apprenticeship agency, or any State board of vocational education, or any joint apprentice committee, or the Bureau of Apprenticeship established in accordance with chapter 4C of title 29, or any agency of the Federal Government authorized to supervise such training.

"(8) The term 'State' includes the Canal Zone.

"(9) The term 'Commissioner' means the United States Commissioner of Education.

"(b) Benefits shall not be afforded under this chapter to any individual on account of service as a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, or of the Regular or Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service.

"(c) The Congress of the United States hereby declares that the veterans' education and training program created by this chapter is for the purpose of providing vocational readjustment and restoring lost educational opportunities to those service men and women whose educational or vocational ambitions have been interrupted or impeded by reason of active duty between January 31, 1955, and the date of termination of compulsory military service under the laws of the United States and for the purpose of aiding such persons in attaining the educational and training status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained had they not served their country.

"Subchapter II—Eligibility

"§ 1910. Entitlement to education or training generally

"Each eligible veteran shall, subject to the provisions of this chapter, be entitled to an education and training loan for the purpose of assisting him in pursuing a program of education or training. Any such loan made under this chapter shall be repayable by the veteran as hereinafter provided.

"§ 1911. Computation of veteran's loan entitlement

"(a) Each eligible veteran shall be entitled to receive an education and training loan under this title to assist him in obtaining education or training over a period equal to one and one-half times the duration of the active duty performed by him between February 1, 1955, and the date of termination of compulsory military service under the laws of the United States, except that—

"(1) in computing the duration of such service there shall be excluded a period equal to any period he was assigned by the Armed Forces to a civilian institution for a course of education or training which was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians or served as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies;

"(2) the period of education or training to which an eligible veteran shall be entitled under this chapter shall not, except as provided in subsection (b), exceed thirty-six months reduced by a period equivalent to any period of educational assistance afforded him under chapters 33 and 35 of this title; and

"(3) the period of education or training to which an eligible veteran shall be entitled under this chapter together with vocational rehabilitation training received under chapter 31 of this title, and education or training received under part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1(a), and section 12(a) of the Act enacting this title shall not, except as provided in subsection (b), exceed thirty-six months in the aggregate.

"(b) Whenever the period of entitlement to education or training under this

chapter of an eligible veteran who is enrolled in an educational institution regularly operated on the quarter or semester system ends during a quarter or semester and after a major part of such semester or quarter has expired, such period shall be extended to the termination of such unexpired quarter or semester. In all other courses offered by educational institutions, whenever the period of eligibility ends after a major portion of the course is completed such period may be extended to the end of the course or for nine weeks, whichever is the lesser period.

"(c) In the case of any eligible veteran who is pursuing any program of education or training exclusively by correspondence, one-fourth of the elapsed time in the following such program of education or training shall be charged against the veteran's period of entitlement.

"§ 1912. Commencement; time limitations

"(a) No eligible veteran shall be entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter after three years after his discharge or release from active duty or after three years after the date of enactment of this chapter, whichever is later. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, any otherwise eligible veteran whom the Administrator determines to have been prevented from initiating a program of education or training under this chapter within the period prescribed by the preceding sentence because he had not met the nature of discharge requirements of section 1908(a) (1) (B) of this title before a change, correction, or modification of a discharge or dismissal made pursuant to section 1553 of title 10, the correction of the military records of the proper service department under section 1552 of title 10, or other corrective action by competent authority, shall be permitted to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter within three years after the date of his discharge or dismissal was so changed, corrected, or modified, or within three years after the date of enactment of this chapter, whichever is later.

"(b) The program of education and training of an eligible veteran under this chapter shall, on and after the delimiting date for the veteran to initiate his program, be pursued continuously until completion, except that an eligible veteran may suspend the pursuit of his program for periods of not more than twelve consecutive months, and may suspend the pursuit of such program for longer periods if the Administrator finds that the suspension for each such period was due to conditions beyond the control of the eligible veteran.

"(c) In the event an eligible veteran returns to active service in the Armed Forces prior to the date on which compulsory service under the laws of the United States terminates, his date of discharge or release shall, for the purposes of this section and section 1913, be the date of discharge or release from his last period of active service which began prior to the date of termination of compulsory military service under the laws of the United States.

"§ 1913. Expiration of all education and training

"No education or training shall be afforded an eligible veteran under this chapter beyond eight years after his discharge or release from active duty or eight years after the enactment of this chapter, whichever is later, except that any veteran who is eligible to initiate a program of education or training by reason of the second sentence of section 1912(a) of this title shall be permitted to pursue, subject to the other provisions of this chapter, such program for a period of not more than five years after the date of initiation thereof; but in no event shall education or training be afforded under this chapter more than ten years after the date

of termination of compulsory military service under the laws of the United States.

"Subchapter III—Enrollment

"§ 1920. Selection of program

"Subject to the provisions of this chapter, each eligible veteran may select a program of education or training to assist him in attaining an educational, professional, or vocational objective at any educational institution or training establishment selected by him, whether or not located in the State in which he resides, which will accept and retain him as a student or trainee in any field or branch of knowledge which such institution or establishment finds him qualified to undertake or pursue. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, an eligible veteran may not pursue a program of education or training at an educational institution or training establishment which is not located in a State, unless such program is pursued at an approved educational institution of higher learning. The Administrator in his discretion may deny or discontinue the enrollment under this chapter of any veteran in a foreign educational institution if he finds that such enrollment is not for the best interest of the veteran or the Government.

"§ 1921. Applications; approval

"Any eligible veteran who desires to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter shall submit an application to the Administrator which shall be in such form, and contain such information, as the Administrator shall prescribe. The Administrator shall approve such application unless he finds that such veteran is not eligible for or entitled to the education or training applied for or that his program of education or training fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter, or that the eligible veteran is already qualified, by reason of previous education and training, for the educational, professional, or vocational objective for which the courses of the program of education or training are offered. The Administrator shall notify the eligible veteran of the approval or disapproval of his application.

"§ 1922. Change of program

"(a) Subject to the provisions of section 1921 of this title, each eligible veteran (except an eligible veteran whose program has been interrupted or discontinued due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application) may, at any time before the end of the period during which he is entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter, make not more than one change of program of education or training.

"(b) Each eligible veteran, who has not made a change of program of education or training before the expiration of the period during which he is entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter, may make not more than one change of program of education or training with the approval of the Administrator. The Administrator shall approve such a change if he finds that—

"(1) the eligible veteran is not making satisfactory progress in his present program and that the failure is not due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application, and if the program to which the eligible veteran desires to change is more in keeping with his aptitude or previous education and training; or

"(2) the program to which the eligible veteran desires to change, while not a part of the program currently pursued by him, is a normal progression from such program.

"(c) As used in this section the term 'change of program of education or training' shall not be deemed to include a change from the pursuit of one program to pursuit of another where the first program is prerequisite to, or generally required for, entrance into pursuit of the second.

"§ 1923. Disapproval of enrollment in certain courses

"(a) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran in any bartending course, dancing course, or personality development course.

"(b) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran—

"(1) in any photography course or entertainment course; or

"(2) in any music course—instrumental or vocal—public speaking course, or course in sports or athletics such as horseback riding, swimming, fishing, skiing, golf, baseball, tennis, bowling, sports officiating, or other sport or athletic course, except courses of applied music, physical education or public speaking which are offered by institutions of higher learning for credit as an integral part of a program leading to an educational objective; or

"(3) in any other type of course which the Administrator finds to be avocational or recreational in character;

unless the eligible veteran submits justification showing that the course will be of bonafide use in the pursuit of his present or contemplated business or occupation.

"(c) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of any eligible veteran, not already enrolled, in any nonaccredited course below the college level offered by a proprietary profit or proprietary nonprofit educational institution for any period during which the Administrator finds that more than eighty-five per centum of the students enrolled in the course are having all or any part of their tuition, fees, or other charges paid to or for them by the educational institution or the Veterans' Administration under this chapter, chapter 31 of this title, or section 12(a) of the Act enacting this title.

"§ 1924. Discontinuance of education and training loans for unsatisfactory progress

"The Administrator shall discontinue the education and training loans of an eligible veteran if, at any time, he finds that, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the educational institution or training establishment, the conduct or progress of such veteran is unsatisfactory.

"§ 1925. Period of operation for approval

"(a) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran in any course offered by an educational institution when such course has been in operation for less than two years.

"(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to—

"(1) any course to be pursued in a public or other tax-supported educational institution;

"(2) any course which is offered by an educational institution which has been in operation for more than two years, if such course is similar in character to the instruction previously given by such institution;

"(3) any course which has been offered by an institution for a period of more than two years, notwithstanding the institution has moved to another location within the same general locality; or

"(4) any course which is offered by a nonprofit educational institution of college level and which is recognized for credit toward a standard college degree.

"§ 1926. Institutions listed by Attorney General

"The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of, or payment of an education and training loan to, any eligible veteran in any course in an educational institution or training establishment while it is listed by the Attorney General under section 3 of part III of Executive Order 9835, as amended.

"Subchapter IV—Loans to Veterans

"§ 1931. Education and training loans

"(a) The Administrator shall pay to each eligible veteran who is pursuing a program

of education or training under this chapter, and who applies therefor, an education and training loan to meet in part the expenses of his subsistence, tuition, fees, supplies, books, and equipment.

"(b) The education and training loan for an eligible veteran shall be paid, as provided in section 1932 of this title, only for the period of the veteran's enrollment as approved by the Administrator, but no allowance shall be paid—

"(1) to any veteran enrolled in an institutional course which leads to a standard college degree or a course of institutional on-farm training for any period when the veteran is not pursuing his course in accordance with the regularly established policies and regulations of the institution and the requirements of this chapter;

"(2) to any veteran enrolled in an institutional course which does not lead to a standard college degree or in a course of apprenticeship or other training on the job for any day of absence in excess of thirty days in a twelve-month period, not counting as absences weekends or legal holidays established by Federal or State law during which the institution or establishment is not regularly in session or operation; or

"(3) to any veteran pursuing his program of education exclusively by correspondence for any period during which no lessons were serviced by the institution.

"(c) No education and training loan shall be paid to an eligible veteran for any period until the Administrator shall have received—

"(1) from the eligible veteran (A) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in an institutional course which leads to a standard college degree or a course of institutional on-farm training, a certification that he was actually enrolled in and pursuing the course as approved by the Administrator, or (B) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in an institutional course which does not lead to a standard college degree or a course of apprenticeship or other training on the job, a certification as to actual attendance during such period, or (C) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in a program of education or training by correspondence, a certification as to the number of lessons actually completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution; and

"(2) from the educational institution or training establishment, a certification, or an endorsement on the veteran's certificate, that such veteran was enrolled in and pursuing a course of education or training during such period, and, in the case of an institution furnishing education or training to a veteran exclusively by correspondence, a certification, or an endorsement on the veteran's certificate, as to the number of lessons completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution. Education and training loans shall, insofar as practicable, be paid within twenty days after receipt by the Administrator of the certifications required by this subsection.

"§ 1932. Computation of education and training loan

"(a) The education and training loan of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training in an educational institution and is not entitled to receive an education and training loan under subsection (b), (c), (d), (e), or (f) shall be computed as follows:

"(1) If such program is pursued on a full-time basis, such loan shall be computed at the rate of \$110 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of \$135 per month, if he has one dependent, or at the rate of \$160 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(2) If such program is pursued on a three-quarters time basis, such loan shall be computed at the rate of \$80 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of \$100 per month, if he has one dependent,

or at the rate of \$120 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(3) If such program is pursued on a half-time basis, such loan shall be computed at the rate of \$50 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of \$60 per month, if he has one dependent, or at the rate of \$80 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(b) The education and training loan of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a full-time program of education and training which consists of institutional courses and on-the-job training, with the on-the-job training portion of the program being strictly supplemental to the institutional portion, shall be computed at the rate of (1) \$90 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) \$110 per month if he has one dependent, or (3) \$130 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(c) The education and training loan of an eligible veteran pursuing apprenticeship or other training on the job shall be computed at the rate of (1) \$70 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) \$85 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) \$105 per month, if he has more than one dependent; except that his education and training loan shall be reduced at the end of each four-month period as his program progresses by an amount which bears the same ratio to the basic education and training loan as four months bears to the total duration of his apprentice or other training on the job; but in no case shall the Administrator provide an education and training loan under this subsection in an amount which, when added to the compensation to be paid to the veteran, in accordance with his approved training program, for productive labor performed as a part of his course, would exceed the rate of \$310 per month. For the purpose of computing loans under this subsection, the duration of the training of an eligible veteran shall be the period specified in the approved application as the period during which he may receive an education and training loan for such training, plus such additional period, if any, as is necessary to make the number of months of such training a multiple of four.

"(d) The education and training loan of an eligible veteran pursuing institutional on-farm training shall be computed at the rate of (1) \$95 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) \$110 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) \$130 per month, if he has more than one dependent; except that his education and training loan shall be reduced at the end of the third, and each subsequent, four-month period as his program progresses by an amount which bears the same ratio to \$65 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or \$80 per month, if he has one dependent, or \$100 per month, if he has more than one dependent, as four months bears to the total duration of such veteran's institutional on-farm training reduced by eight months. For the purpose of computing loans under this subsection, the duration of the training of an eligible veteran shall be the period specified in the approved application as the period during which he may receive an education and training loan for such training, plus such additional period, if any, as is necessary to make the number of such months of such training a multiple of four.

"(e) The education and training loan of an eligible veteran pursuing a program of education or training exclusively by correspondence shall be computed on the basis of the established charge which the institution requires nonveterans to pay for the course or courses pursued by the eligible veteran. Such loan shall be disbursed quarterly on a pro rata basis for the lessons completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution as certified by the institution.

“(b) The Administrator shall be responsible for the approval of courses of education or training offered by any agency of the Federal Government authorized under other laws to supervise such education or training. The Administrator may approve

any course in any other educational institution or training establishment in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

"§ 1943. Cooperation

"(a) The Administrator and each State approving agency shall take cognizance of the fact that definite duties, functions, and responsibilities are conferred upon the Administrator and each State approving agency under the veterans' educational programs. To assure that such programs are effectively and efficiently administered, the cooperation of the Administrator and the State approving agencies is essential. It is necessary to establish an exchange of information pertaining to activities of educational institutions and training establishments, and particular attention should be given to the enforcement of approval standards, enforcement of wage and income limitations, enforcement of enrollment restrictions, and fraudulent and other criminal activities on the part of persons connected with educational institutions and training establishments in which veterans are enrolled under this chapter.

"(b) The Administrator will furnish the State approving agencies with copies of such Veterans' Administration informational material as may aid them in carrying out this chapter.

"§ 1944. Use of Office of Education and other Federal agencies

"(a) In carrying out his functions under this chapter, the Administrator may utilize the facilities and services of any other Federal department or agency. The Administrator shall utilize the services of the Office of Education in developing cooperative agreements between the Administrator and State and local agencies relating to the approval of courses of education or training as provided for in section 1945 of this title, in reviewing the plan of operations of State approving agencies under such agreements, and in rendering technical assistance to such State and local agencies in developing and improving policies, standards, and legislation in connection with their duties under this chapter.

"(b) Any such utilization shall be pursuant to proper agreement with the Federal department or agency concerned; and payment to cover the cost thereof shall (except in the case of the Office of Education) be made either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be provided in such agreement. Funds necessary to enable the Office of Education to carry out its functions under this chapter are authorized to be appropriated directly to such Office.

"§ 1945. Reimbursement of expenses

"The Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts or agreements with State and local agencies to pay such State and local agencies for reasonable and necessary expenses of salary and travel incurred by employees of such agencies in (1) rendering necessary services in ascertaining the qualifications of educational institutions and training establishments for furnishing courses of education or training to eligible veterans under this chapter, and in the supervision of such educational institutions and training establishments, and (2) furnishing, at the request of the Administrator, any other services in connection with this chapter. Each such contract or agreement shall be conditioned upon compliance with the standards and provisions of this chapter.

"Subchapter VI—Approval of courses of education and training

"§ 1951. Apprentice or other training on the job

"(a) Apprentice or other training on the job shall consist of courses offered by training establishments whenever such courses of training are furnished in accordance with the provisions of this section. Any training establishment desiring to furnish a course of apprentice or other training on the job

shall submit to the appropriate State approving agency a written application setting forth the course of training for each job for which an eligible veteran is to be trained. The written application covering the course of training shall include the following:

"(1) Title and description of the specific job objective for which the eligible veteran is to be trained;

"(2) The length of the training period;

"(3) A schedule listing various operations for major kinds of work or tasks to be learned and showing for each, job operations or work, tasks to be performed, and the approximate length of time to be spent on each operation or task;

"(4) The wage or salary to be paid at the beginning of the course of training, at each successive step in the course, and at the completion of training;

"(5) The entrance wage or salary paid by the establishment to employees already trained in the kind of work for which the veteran is to be trained; and

"(6) The number of hours of supplemental related instruction required.

"(b) The appropriate State approving agency may approve a course of apprentice or other training on the job specified in an application submitted by a training establishment in accordance with subsection (a) if such training establishment is found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

"(1) The training content of the course is adequate to qualify the eligible veteran for appointment to the job for which he is to be trained.

"(2) There is reasonable certainty that the job for which the eligible veteran is to be trained will be available to him at the end of the training period.

"(3) The job is one in which progression and appointment to the next higher classification are based upon skills learned through organized training on the job and not on such factors as length of service and normal turnover.

"(4) The wages to be paid the eligible veteran for each successive period of training are not less than those customarily paid in the training establishment and in the community to a learner in the same job who is not a veteran.

"(5) The job customarily requires a period of training of not less than three months and not more than two years of full-time training, except that this provision shall not apply to apprentice training.

"(6) The length of the training period is no longer than that customarily required by the training establishment and other training establishments in the community to provide an eligible veteran with the required skills, arrange for the acquiring of job knowledge, technical information, and other facts which the eligible veteran will need to learn in order to become competent on the job for which he is being trained.

"(7) Provision is made for related instruction for the individual eligible veteran who may need it.

"(8) There is in the training establishment adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide satisfactory training on the job.

"(9) Adequate records are kept to show the progress made by each eligible veteran toward his job objective.

"(10) Appropriate credit is given the eligible veteran for previous training and job experience, whether in the military service or elsewhere, his beginning wage adjusted to the level to which such credit advances him, and his training period shortened accordingly, and provision is made for certification by the training establishment that such credit has been granted and the beginning wage adjusted accordingly. No course of training will be considered bona fide if given to an eligible veteran who is already qualified

by training and experience for the job objective.

"(11) A signed copy of the training agreement for each eligible veteran, including the training program and wage scale as approved by the State approving agency, is provided to the veteran and to the Administrator and the State approving agency by the employer.

"(12) Upon completion of the course of training furnished by the training establishment, the eligible veteran is given a certificate by the employer indicating the length and type of training provided and that the eligible veteran has completed the course of training on the job satisfactorily.

"(13) That the course meets such other criteria as may be established by the State approving agency.

"§ 1952. Institutional on-farm training

"(a) An eligible veteran shall be entitled to the benefits of this chapter while enrolled in a course of full-time institutional on-farm training which has been approved by the appropriate State approving agency in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(b) The State approving agency may approve a course of institutional on-farm training when it satisfies the following requirements:

"(1) The course combines organized group instruction in agricultural and related subjects of at least two hundred hours per year (and of at least eight hours each month) at an educational institution, with supervised work experience on a farm or other agricultural establishment.

"(2) The eligible veteran will perform a part of such course on a farm or other agricultural establishment under his control.

"(3) The course is developed with due consideration to the size and character of the farm or other agricultural establishment on which the eligible veteran will receive his supervised work experience and to the need of such eligible veteran, in the type of farming for which he is training, for proficiency in planning, producing, marketing, farm mechanics, conservation of resources, food conservation, farm financing, farming management, and the keeping of farm and home accounts.

"(4) The eligible veteran will receive not less than one hundred hours of individual instruction per year, not less than fifty hours of which shall be on such farm or other agricultural establishment (with at least two visits by the instructor to such farm each month). Such individual instruction shall be given by the instructor responsible for the veteran's institutional instruction and shall include instruction and home-study assignments in the preparation of budgets, inventories, and statements showing the production, use on the farm, and sale of crops, livestock, and livestock products.

"(5) The eligible veteran will be assured of control of such farm or other agricultural establishment (whether by ownership, lease, management, agreement, or other tenure arrangement) until the completion of his course.

"(6) Such farm or other agricultural establishment shall be of a size and character which (A) will, together with the group-instruction part of the course, occupy the full time of the eligible veteran, (B) will permit instruction in all aspects of the management of the farm or other agricultural establishment of the type for which the eligible veteran is being trained, and will provide the eligible veteran an opportunity to apply to the operation of his farm or other agricultural establishment the major portion of the farm practices taught in the group-instruction part of the course, and (C) will assure him a satisfactory income for a reasonable living under normal conditions at least by the end of his course.

"(7) Provision shall be made for certification by the institution and the veteran that

the training offered does not repeat or duplicate training previously received by the veteran.

"(8) The institutional on-farm training meets such other fair and reasonable standards as may be established by the State approving agency.

"§ 1953. Approval of accredited courses

"(a) A State approving agency may approve the courses offered by an educational institution when—

"(1) such courses have been accredited and approved by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association;

"(2) credit for such course is approved by the State department of education for credit toward a high school diploma;

"(3) such courses are conducted under sections 11-28 of title 20; or

"(4) such courses are accepted by the State department of education for credit for a teacher's certificate or a teacher's degree.

For the purposes of this chapter the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies and associations which he determines to be a reliable authority as to the quality of training offered by an educational institution and the State approving agencies may, upon concurrence, utilize the accreditation of such accrediting associations or agencies for approval of the courses specifically accredited and approved by such accrediting association or agency. In making application for approval, the institution shall transmit to the State approving agency copies of its catalog or bulletin.

"(b) As a condition to approval under this section, the State approving agency must find that adequate records are kept by the educational institution to show the progress of each eligible veteran. The State approving agency must also find that the educational institution maintains a written record of the previous education and training of the veteran and clearly indicates that appropriate credit has been given by the institution for previous education and training, with the training period shortened proportionately and the veteran and the Administrator so notified.

"§ 1954. Approval of nonaccredited courses

"(a) No course of education or training (other than a course of institutional on-farm training) which has not been approved by a State approving agency pursuant to section 1953 of this title, which is offered by a public or private, profit or nonprofit, educational institution shall be approved for the purposes of this chapter unless the educational institution offering such course submits to the appropriate State approving agency a written application for approval of such course in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

"(b) Such application shall be accompanied by not less than two copies of the current catalog or bulletin which is certified as true and correct in content and policy by an authorized owner or official and includes the following:

"(1) Identifying data, such as volume number and date of publication;

"(2) Names of the institution and its governing body, officials, and faculty;

"(3) A calendar of the institution showing legal holidays, beginning and ending date of each quarter, term, or semester, and other important dates;

"(4) Institution policy and regulations on enrollment with respect to enrollment dates and specific entrance requirements for each course;

"(5) Institution policy and regulations relative to leave, absences, class cuts, make-up work, tardiness, and interruptions for unsatisfactory attendance;

"(6) Institution policy and regulations relative to standards of progress required of the student by the institution (this policy will define the grading system of the insti-

tution, the minimum grades considered satisfactory, conditions for interruption for unsatisfactory grades or progress and a description of the probationary period, if any, allowed by the institution, and conditions of reentrance for those students dismissed for unsatisfactory progress. A statement will be made regarding progress records kept by the institution and furnished the student);

"(7) Institution policy and regulations relating to student conduct and conditions for dismissal for unsatisfactory conduct;

"(8) Detailed schedules of fees, charges for tuition, books, supplies, tools, student activities, laboratory fees, service charges, rentals, deposits, and all other charges;

"(9) Policy and regulations of the institution relative to the refund of the unused portion of tuition, fees, and other charges in the event the student does not enter the course or withdraws or is discontinued therefrom;

"(10) A description of the available space, facilities, and equipment;

"(11) A course outline for each course for which approval is requested, showing subjects or units in the course, type of work or skill to be learned, and approximate time and clock hours to be spent on each subject or unit; and

"(12) Policy and regulations of the institution relative to granting credit for previous educational training.

"(c) The appropriate State approving agency may approve the application of such institution when the institution and its nonaccredited courses are found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

"(1) The courses, curriculum, and instruction are consistent in quality, content, and length with similar courses in public schools and other private schools in the State, with recognized accepted standards.

"(2) There is in the institution adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide training of good quality.

"(3) Educational and experience qualifications of directors, administrators, and instructors are adequate.

"(4) The institution maintains a written record of the previous education and training of the veteran and clearly indicates that appropriate credit has been given by the institution for previous education and training, with the training period shortened proportionately and the veteran and the Administrator so notified.

"(5) A copy of the course outline, schedule of tuition, fees, and other charges, regulations pertaining to absence, grading policy, and rules of operation and conduct will be furnished the veteran upon enrollment.

"(6) Upon completion of training, the veteran is given a certificate by the institution indicating the approved course and indicating that training was satisfactorily completed.

"(7) Adequate records as prescribed by the State approving agency are kept to show attendance and progress or grades, and satisfactory standards relating to attendance, progress, and conduct are enforced.

"(8) The institution complies with all local, city, county, municipal, State, and Federal regulations, such as fire codes, building and sanitation codes. The State approving agency may require such evidence of compliance as is deemed necessary.

"(9) The institution is financially sound and capable of fulfilling its commitments for training.

"(10) The institution does not utilize advertising of any type which is erroneous or misleading, either by actual statement, omission, or intimation. The institution shall not be deemed to have met this requirement until the State approving agency (A) has ascer-

tained from the Federal Trade Commission whether the Commission has issued an order to the institution to cease and desist from any act or practice, and (B) has, if such an order has been issued, given due weight to that fact.

"(11) The institution does not exceed its enrollment limitations as established by the State approving agency.

"(12) The institution's administrators, directors, owners, and instructors are of good reputation and character.

"(13) The institution has and maintains a policy for the refund of the unused portion of tuition, fees, and other charges in the event the veteran fails to enter the course or withdraws or is discontinued therefrom at any time prior to completion and such policy must provide that the amount charged to the veteran for tuition, fees, and other charges for a portion of the course shall not exceed the approximate pro rata portion of the total charges for tuition, fees, and other charges that the length of the completed portion of the course bears to its total length.

"(14) Such additional criteria as may be deemed necessary by the State approving agency.

"§ 1955. Notice of approval of courses

"The State approving agency, upon determining that an educational institution has complied with all the requirements of this chapter, will issue a letter to such institution setting forth the courses which have been approved for the purposes of this chapter, and will furnish an official copy of such letter and any subsequent amendments to the Administrator. The letter of approval shall be accompanied by a copy of the catalog or bulletin of the institution, as approved by the State approving agency, and shall contain the following information:

"(1) date of letter and effective date of approval of courses;

"(2) proper address and name of each educational institution or training establishment;

"(3) authority for approval and conditions of approval, referring specifically to the approved catalog or bulletin published by the educational institution;

"(4) name of each course approved;

"(5) where applicable enrollment limitations such as maximum numbers authorized and student-teacher ratio;

"(6) signature of responsible official of State approving agency; and

"(7) such other fair and reasonable provisions as are considered necessary by the appropriate State approving agency.

"§ 1956. Disapproval of courses and discontinuance of allowances

"(a) Any course approved for the purposes of this chapter which fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter shall be immediately disapproved by the appropriate State approving agency. An educational institution or training establishment which has its courses disapproved by a State approving agency will be notified of such disapproval by a certified or registered letter of notification and a return receipt secured.

"(b) The Administrator may discontinue the education and training loan of any eligible veteran if he finds that the course of education or training in which such veteran is enrolled fails to meet any of the requirements of this chapter or if he finds that the educational institution or training establishment offering such course has violated any provisions of this chapter or fails to meet any of its requirements.

"(c) Each State approving agency shall notify the Administrator of each course which it has disapproved under this section.

"Subchapter VII—Miscellaneous provisions
"§ 1961. Authority and duties of Administrator

"Education and training loans under this chapter shall be subject to audit and review

by the General Accounting Office as provided by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 and the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950.

"§ 1962. Educational and vocational counseling"

"The Administrator may arrange for educational and vocational counseling to persons eligible for education and training loans under this chapter. At such intervals as he deems necessary, he shall make available information respecting the need for general education and for trained personnel in the various crafts, trades, and professions. Facilities of other Federal agencies collecting such information shall be utilized to the extent he deems practicable.

"§ 1963. Control by agencies of United States"

"No department, agency, or officer of the United States, in carrying out this chapter, shall exercise any supervision or control, whatsoever, over any State approving agency, State educational agency, or State apprenticeship agency, or any educational institution or training establishment. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prevent any department, agency, or officer of the United States from exercising any supervision or control which such department, agency, or officer is authorized by law to exercise over any Federal educational institution or training establishment, or to prevent the furnishing of education or training under this chapter in any institution or establishment over which supervision or control is exercised by such other department, agency, or officer under authority of existing provisions of law.

"§ 1964. Conflicting interests"

"(a) Every officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, or of the Office of Education, who has, while such an officer or employee, owned any interest in, or received any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, any educational institution operated for profit in which an eligible veteran was pursuing a course of education or training under this chapter shall be immediately dismissed from his office or employment.

"(b) If the Administrator finds that any person who is an officer or employee of a State approving agency has, while he was such an officer or employee, owned any interest in, or received any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, an educational institution operated for profit in which an eligible veteran was pursuing a course of education or training under this chapter, he shall discontinue making payments under section 1945 of this title to such State approving agency unless such agency shall, without delay, take such steps as may be necessary to terminate the employment of such person and such payments shall not be resumed while such person is an officer or employee of the State approving agency, or State Department of Veterans Affairs or State Department of Education.

"(c) A State approving agency shall not approve any course offered by an educational institution operated for profit and, if any such course has been approved, shall disapprove each such course, if it finds that any officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, the Office of Education, or the State approving agency owns an interest in, or receives any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, such institution.

"(d) The Administrator may, after reasonable notice and public hearings, waive in writing the application of this section in the case of any officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, of the Office of Education, or of a State approving agency, if he finds that no detriment will result to the United States or to eligible veterans by

reason of such interest or connection of such officer or employee.

"§ 1965. Reports by institutions"

"(a) Educational institutions and training establishments shall, without delay, report to the Administrator in the form prescribed by him, the enrollment, interruption, and termination of the education or training of each eligible veteran enrolled therein under this chapter.

"(b) The Administrator shall pay to each educational institution which is required to submit reports and certifications to the Administrator under this chapter, an allowance at the rate of \$1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution under the provisions of this chapter to assist the educational institution in defraying the expense of preparing and submitting such reports and certifications. Such allowances shall be paid in such manner and at such times as may be prescribed by the Administrator, except that if any institution fails to submit reports or certifications to the Administrator as required by this chapter, no allowance shall be paid to such institution for the month or months during which such reports or certifications were not submitted as required by the Administrator.

"§ 1966. Overpayments to veterans"

"In any case where it is found by the Administrator that a loan or an excessive amount of an otherwise proper loan has been made to a veteran as the result of (1) the willful or negligent failure of the educational institution or training establishment to report, as required by this chapter and applicable regulations, to the Veterans' Administration excessive absences from a course, or discontinuance or interruption of a course by the veteran or (2) false certification by the educational institution or training establishment, the amount of such overpayment shall constitute a liability of such institution or establishment, and may be recovered in the same manner as any other debt due the United States. Any amount so collected shall be reimbursed if the overpayment is recovered from the veteran. This section shall not preclude the imposition of any civil or criminal liability under this or any other law.

"§ 1967. Examination of records"

"The records and accounts of educational institutions and training establishments pertaining to eligible veterans who received education or training under this chapter shall be available for examination by duly authorized representatives of the Government.

"§ 1968. False or misleading statements"

"The Administrator shall not make any payments under this chapter to any person found by him to have willfully submitted any false or misleading claims. In each case where the Administrator finds that an educational institution or training establishment has willfully submitted a false or misleading claim, or where a veteran, with the complicity of an educational institution or training establishment, has submitted such a claim, he shall make a complete report of the facts of the case to the appropriate State approving agency and where deemed advisable to the Attorney General of the United States for appropriate action.

"§ 1969. Information furnished by Federal Trade Commission"

"The Federal Trade Commission shall keep all State approving agencies advised of any information coming to its attention which would be of assistance to such agencies in carrying out their duties under this chapter.

"§ 1970. Effective date"

"This chapter shall take effect on the date of its enactment, but no education and training loan shall be made for any period prior to the first day of the first month which begins more than thirty days after the date of enactment of this chapter."

On page 50, strike out the material between lines 5 and 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"40. Education and training loans--- 1908".

On page 50, strike out the material between lines 8 and 9, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"40. Education and training loans--- 1908".

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, my amendment may be the last amendment to the bill. I have discussed the amendment on previous occasions when the bill was before the Senate. I shall not be long.

The amendment which I offer would not change the benefits which would be provided veterans under S. 9.

It differs from S. 9 in one major respect. S. 9 provides a system of grants to veterans for educational benefits and for training benefits.

My amendment would substitute a system of loans, and it would not change in any other respect the terms of the bill.

The loans which would be made available to veterans under my amendment would be on very easy terms, as arranged between the Veterans' Administration and the veterans.

The loans would be repayable over a term of 12 years. The veteran would sign a note, but no security or surety would be required. No payment would be required until one year after the veteran's education or training had ended. The notes would bear no interest unless payments were in default, and in that event the interest would be 2 percent.

The administrator would be given the authority to waive payment of principal or interest upon a finding based upon equity, justice, or conscience.

I would interpret this to mean that if the administrator should find that a veteran was unable to pay because of sickness, unemployment, family demands, or special reasons beyond his control, the administrator would have wide latitude to suspend, waive, or forgive payment of all or part of the indebtedness of the veteran. These are certainly very reasonable terms.

From my detailing of the liberal loan provision, it is obvious that any veteran who meets the eligibility requirements of S. 9—and they would be the same under my amendment—would find the loan provisions of the amendment not only reasonable, but very generous if he or she had the desire to secure an education or secure training.

The reasoning behind the bill of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is that those who are called into service are placed at a disadvantage against those who are not called into service, and they deserve some means of readjustment when they return to civilian life.

The amendment which I offer follows the same reasoning. We agree also that educational and training benefits provide the best method of readjustment. But the difference is that my amendment would demand a greater incentive on the part of the veteran.

Those who will take advantage of the loans will seriously want to obtain the educational and training benefits that will be available to them.

On the other hand, those who do not really wish to secure education or training benefits for their readjustment might take the grants which are offered by S. 9, but would not be interested in the loans. In this context it is reasonable to consider cost.

The Senator from Texas has stated that the bill would cost almost \$2 billion over a period of 5 years. But we know that the draft will continue. We know that if we do not get into a real war, it is unlikely that we shall soon escape the conditions which cause a continuance of the cold war. The report shows that by 1970, 6 million persons will be serving in the Armed Forces, so it can be estimated that the actual cost of S. 9 will reach \$5 billion.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Not having had the opportunity to read the Senator's amendment, does it, in substituting loans for grants, draw any distinction between persons who have served in combat areas and those who have served in this country?

Mr. COOPER. No; it draws no distinction, for this reason: The logic, the gravamen, the philosophy of S. 9, as expounded by the Senator from Texas, is that it is needed because young men, and some young women, are drawn from their normal lives and occupations at a time when they might be ready to go to school, and that as compared with their fellows, they are placed at some disadvantage. For 2 years, they are not able to proceed with their school or college education; they are not able to go ahead in the occupations they might have entered. It is argued that because of these circumstances they deserve adjustment benefits.

If we accept this proposition, then it is correct to say that whether a person is serving in the United States or in Vietnam, he has postponed for 2 years or whatever term of service he gives to the country, his education or employment.

Although I do not know that this thesis would be entirely accepted, I voted for the two amendments which have just been rejected.

The thinking behind my amendment is that if it is the purpose of S. 9 to provide educational benefits, we ought to write a bill which would provide incentive for those who actually want an education. Otherwise, the bill takes on the characteristics of a bonus.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is any distinction made between a member of the armed services who serves, let us say, 6 months and one who serves 3 or 4 years, so far as the amount of benefits is concerned? Would one who served only 6 months receive more benefits and readjustments than a person who served 3 or 4 years?

Mr. COOPER. My amendment follows S. 9. In the first place, 6-month veterans are not covered in the bill. The minimum service is 180 days.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is approximately 6 months.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct. But those who select 6 months as their choice of a period of service are not covered by the bill. But if one entered the service for a longer term but for some reason could serve only 6 months, he would be covered by the bill.

The Senator from Iowa will recall that among the choices that are available to those who enter the Armed Forces, a 6-month period of training is available and that after that the person is required to take a certain amount of Reserve training.

S. 9 does not provide benefits for those who make the 6-month service choice. However, if one enlisted or was inducted for a longer period, but for some reason could serve only a lesser period, such as 6 months, he would be covered by the bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Suppose he served 2 years. Would he receive more benefits than one who served 6 months?

Mr. COOPER. Yes. For every day of service—

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Day and one-half.

Mr. COOPER. For every day of service over 6 months, under the terms of my amendment, as in S. 9, he would be able to secure a day and a half of school, college, or training unit benefits. That is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is correct. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for clarifying that point. The veteran would receive 1½ day's training for each day in service, not to exceed 36 months. No one could go to school, under the bill, for more than 36 months. His schooling would depend on the length of his service.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator's amendment would provide a loan at a low rate of interest for the veteran who really wanted to get an education. If he did not want to get an education, he would not ask for a loan.

Mr. COOPER. Yes. It is possible that some would take a grant and go to school, perhaps not with the intention of completing their education or training.

But by providing for a loan this possibility is diminished. Those who were really interested in education would, I believe, be willing to take a loan.

I believe that the effect of the bill on the educational attainments of the veterans would be enhanced.

Again—and this may sound old-fashioned—I do not believe there is anything wrong in asking that those who receive benefits make an effort of their own. Thousands have done so in the past; thousands will do so in the future. It will not harm any veteran who has spent an average of 28 months in the armed services.

We are caught in a cold war. Unless there is some change in the attitude of

the Communist countries, or some accommodation between the Communist countries and our country, the cold war will continue and thousands, hundreds of thousands, millions of young men will serve. It is a duty and an honor to serve.

It is not a happy circumstance which calls young men into the service. It is not a circumstance which is pleasing to the families, wives, and children of these young men. We are not happy about it. But the duty must be discharged. I believe we should make provisions for them as they return to civilian life.

It is my belief that a loan program would be a generous and reasonable program.

I offer this amendment as a reasonable amendment and one which I believe has merit. I hope very much that the Senate will agree to the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I oppose the Cooper amendment.

We know of the important record which the GI bill made in the field of education. The GI bill, in one sense, represented a loan of the people of this country to the future expansion and wealth of this Nation. The GI beneficiaries of the bill received their college degrees, and their vocational training under it. They now earn so much more income than they would have earned if they had not received their college degrees or their post secondary training, that they are now paying additional taxes to the Treasury over what they would have otherwise paid. They have done so for more than a decade. The increased taxes paid by those veterans have wiped out and will continue to wipe out time and again the so-called original investment in the GI bill.

I do not know how we can better justify than in the way this measure attempts to do, or compensate for the dislocation of the economic well-being that occurs to our GI's when they are taken into service. After this bill is enacted into law, veterans who take advantage of the opportunities which will be accorded by the bill will pay in the future additional tax dollars that they would otherwise never have been able to pay.

It is at least parsimonious for us to take the position that we will let them go to college if they borrow the money, but that we will not recognize that we have an obligation to see that they have the opportunity to go to college if they so choose and then repay the investment by way of additional tax dollars on the money they would earn by virtue of their education.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, after World War II, 60 percent of the veterans decided not to go to school because the allowance was not sufficient. After the Korean war, only 45 percent of the veterans went to school. The other veterans did not go because they would have had to borrow money, or their wives would have had to work.

This measure is not a bonus. It would not permit any boondoggling. This measure would not provide enough money to keep the veterans in school.

Mr. President, in order to save time, I ask unanimous consent that the explanation which has been placed on the desks of Senators be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOPER LOAN AMENDMENT WOULD BE INEFFECTIVE AND WOULD NOT HAVE THE ADVANTAGES CLAIMED FOR IT

The amounts of money provided by S. 9 are not intended to be sufficient to cover all the costs of the veteran's education. As the committee report points out on page 18, "The majority of veterans attending school under this bill will have to supplement the educational grant with part-time employment and in many cases the wives of these veterans will also have to work to help pay for their husbands' training."

The average charge for tuition and required fees in institutions of higher education in 1963 was \$576.80. The median charge for dormitory rooms was \$207.45. The median charge for board rates was \$398.80. These three basic college expense figures add to \$1,183.35. S. 9 will provide only \$990 for a 9-month college course to an unmarried veteran. Thus there is already a discrepancy for basic expenses alone of \$193.35. To these basic expenses must be added those for other necessities such as books, clothes, and medical care. With these figures in mind it does not take too much imagination to see a picture of the typical veteran going to school under the GI bill. He works part time. He is forced to go into debt to borrow money. When he isn't working he is studying or going to class. He has no time for any of the luxuries or enjoyments of life.

This picture is a far cry from the one which some people would paint of a veteran growing fat and lazy because of undue largess from the Government. It is still going to be a struggle with the small grant authorized in S. 9, but at least this grant will provide the nucleus of a stake in civilian life for the discharged veteran, around which he can, if he works hard and has the ability, build a future of hope rather than despair, for himself.

If we provide loans, instead of an educational allowance, the great majority of young men will not choose to avail themselves of the program. Four years of borrowing under a loan program would put a student \$3,960 in debt. If you add this to the other debts he would run up, since this figure doesn't cover the total costs of his education, one can only conclude that a loan program alone would be worth little in assisting young men to continue their education. A young man is not going to want to go that deeply into debt at the beginning of his adult life, when he has no financial experience. The gains to be derived from further education will be so far away in terms of years and so unclear and ill-defined in terms of the impact that they make upon a young man's mind, that he will be unwilling to go deeply into debt on the chance that perhaps 4 years later he may be able to make extra money sufficient to pay the loan back. He will instead decide to go right to work, with no more education. The result is a loss both to himself and to society.

The argument that the loan program will be cheaper does not stand up under analysis. The World War II GI bill continues to pay for itself at a rate of close to \$1 billion a year. The GI's who went to school under the bill became more productive members of society, which was reflected in higher incomes that produced additional income taxes. The additional taxes that will be paid by the massive numbers of veterans who will go to college under S. 9 will result in far more money being paid into the National Treasury

than would the additional taxes plus the repayment of loans that would be produced by the adoption of a loan program, because of the greatly diminished number of veterans who would participate in a loan program. Thus in the long run the program set up by S. 9, the same type of program which proved so successful in the World War II and Korean GI bills, would put money into the Public Treasury, not take it out. Furthermore, it would add much more revenue than would a loan program.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a GI could not go to school on this modest allowance, if he did not have sufficient money to go to school in the first place.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, thousands of boys and girls in the United States are going to school and working their way through on less money than this measure would provide. Under the National Defense Education Act, the scale would be less than this amount.

Thousands of boys and girls who have the will to go to school are going. I ask that we give the veterans the same opportunity.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as the record shows, of the veterans of the Korean conflict who went to school, 80 percent worked, or their wives worked, or they borrowed money. There was no record of those who borrowed money outside the college.

The record shows that in 1952, \$72 would buy as much as \$110 would buy today. The record also shows that the tuition in private and public colleges has doubled since 1952.

These allowances have not gone up 1 percent. This would be a more restrictive bill than existed for the Korean veteran. One measure would provide 60 days rather than 90 days in which the veteran would have to make a decision.

The able Senator is very fair. I commend the distinguished Senator from Kentucky for his fairness. The Senator said he would cut expenses more than this. Surely he would. We are trying to let the veteran have a readjustment period to learn how to make a living before he would come back.

The letter from California that was printed in the RECORD earlier today shows that, of the veterans returning from the cold war, over 10 percent in California are unemployed. The unemployment rate in California is 5 percent. These veterans make up part of that percentage. Therefore, the veterans who served in the cold war have an unemployment rate three times as high as those who did not.

If a man had sufficient credit on which he can borrow money to go to college, he would not have to go to Vietnam.

The radio reported today that 60 percent of the unit on which the Communists opened mortar fire yesterday were drafted. They were drafted because they did not have the money to go to college. Those men have given up an average of 28 months to the service. It is a gross unfairness to say, "We will let you borrow money, as others borrow money under the NDEA," when those who borrowed under the NDEA did not have to go to war. Such a provision would not make up for the loss of time.

This bill would provide a minimum amount. It would not be sufficient to keep them in college. However, if they have the incentive, they can take this money and get a job on the side or their wives can go to work. However, they must have the incentive to go to college and make good. It takes more than this allowance to put a man through college.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment which has been proposed by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. The purpose of S. 9 just cannot be realized if it is turned into a loan program.

Realize the situation which the returned GI faces. He has served for 2 or more years on a pay scale which we all know does not allow him to save any money. He faces a serious readjustment problem. He is behind his contemporaries in his education and his employability. S. 9 would give him just \$110 a month for an education. This amount is too small to give him any kind of free ride. After the Korean war, 80 percent of those who took advantage of the GI bill had to get outside help either by working or getting a loan. Thus, the veteran will have to work or get loans to supplement the amount which S. 9 offers to him. If the initial program, the purpose of which is to provide an incentive for the veteran to go to school, turns out to be just a loan, it could not possibly ever accomplish its purpose.

The average age of returning GI's today is 22.3. To ask such a man to start out his life at that age—when he already has or very soon will have a wife and children—with a loan hanging over his head, is just asking too much. It will be too hard on the returning veteran, and the consequence will simply be that he will not obtain the education which he needs and deserves.

Our young men who serve make a special contribution—they deserve special recognition. Realistic assistance for readjustment requires that S. 9 not be confined to a loan program. Thirty-five percent of our returning veterans have not finished high school. It is simply unreasonable to expect these young men to complete their education if they have to saddle themselves with a loan before they can even start doing so.

I hope the Senate will not defeat the purpose of S. 9. I urge the Senate to reject the Cooper amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Kentucky. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 65, as follows:

[No. 191 Leg.]

YEAS—20

Bennett	Hickenlooper	Simpson
Cooper	Hruska	Symington
Cotton	Jordan, Idaho	Thurmond
Curtis	Lausche	Tower
Dirksen	Morton	Williams, Del.
Dominick	Murphy	Young, N. Dak.
Fannin	Saltonstall	

NAYS—65

Aiken	Harris	Montoya
Allott	Hart	Morse
Anderson	Hartke	Moss
Bartlett	Hill	Mundt
Bass	Holland	Muskie
Bayh	Inouye	Nelson
Bible	Jackson	Pearson
Boggs	Javits	Pell
Burdick	Kennedy, Mass.	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, N.Y.	Proxmire
Cannon	Kuchel	Robertson
Carlson	Long, Mo.	Russell, Ga.
Case	Long, La.	Russell, S.C.
Church	Magnuson	Scott
Clark	Mansfield	Smathers
Dodd	McCarthy	Smith
Douglas	McClellan	Stennis
Ellender	McGee	Talmadge
Fong	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	McIntyre	Yarborough
Gore	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Mondale	

NOT VOTING—15

Brewster	Jordan, N.C.	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Metcalfe	Randolph
Eastland	Miller	Ribicoff
Ervin	Monroney	Sparkman
Hayden	Neuberger	Tydings

So Mr. COOPER's substitute amendment was rejected.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I will support the pending bill on passage, not because I think the cold war approach is best, but because I want the House of Representatives to have a prompt opportunity to consider the general problem involved.

I know that the House has in the past wisely refused to accept the cold war, omnibus approach. I also know that

many distinguished Members of the House have expressed concern about the need to provide now for Vietnam veterans.

I expect the House Veterans' Committee to consider this situation with its customary thoroughness, and I hope that the House experts will revise S. 9 into the Vietnam GI bill which we so badly need.

In the meantime, Mr. President, I shall do all I can to urge the Senate to write a Vietnam GI bill into law as a part of the coming higher education bill.

I therefore will vote "aye" on final passage today because of our acute responsibility to the more than 70,000 men in Vietnam and their supporting forces; and because I hope that the omnibus bill can be made the vehicle in the House for the emergence of a "Vietnam GI bill."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, after long years of effort, the cold war GI bill of rights has reached the Senate floor for debate.

The many other Members of this body who have cosponsored this legislation and I owe a great debt to the leadership, perseverance, and untiring zeal of the senior Senator from Texas who has fought so long and valiantly for this legislation. I salute him on this occasion, even as I join him in urging passage of this bill.

The Cold War Veterans Readjustment Act, as the bill is formally known, is intended to extend the benefits of readjustment assistance to veterans of the cold war who have served their country since 1955. It will continue the salutary benefits of the World War II and Korean war GI bills. Justice to our citizen soldiers demands the enactment of this bill, and recent developments in southeast Asia have once again demonstrated vividly that the cold war is no less dangerous and harrowing than many a hot war. It has disrupted the lives of millions of young Americans who have selflessly contributed their service to the defense of freedom all across the globe. I need not labor this point further with my distinguished colleagues for the unhappy facts of the world situation are too well known to all in this body.

I would take only a few minutes more of the Senate's time to point out the importance of the effects this legislation will have. It has been the recent history of our industrial society that 30 percent or more of our unemployed are below age 25. The majority of these jobseekers, until the recent implementation of President Johnson's war on poverty, had little hope of discovering a permanent solution to their dilemma. The very rapid forward thrust of automation and the constant threat of foreign competition, along with increasing numbers in the employment market, will require continuing and intensive efforts to solve the problems of employment for our youth. The enactment of this legislation would entitle a large segment of our younger citizens to the training necessary to develop employment skills which are so critically needed in our increasingly complex civilization.

As many of my distinguished colleagues will recall, I have often spoken

on this floor of the growing need for greater scientific competence in our job market. This legislation would, in large degree, provide a means for filling that need. For that reason, as well as because of the basic considerations of justice and equity, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this landmark legislation.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, more than 2 years ago I appeared to testify before the subcommittee chaired by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas. My testimony—the first I had given on a piece of major legislation since becoming a Member of this august body—urged passage of S. 9, the cold war GI bill.

The passage of time has, if anything, reinforced my early belief that the enactment of this legislation is direly needed.

We need this bill. Its passage is demanded by a sense of justice toward our service veterans and by a sound, hard-headed evaluation of the general benefits that would result from its enactment.

For good and sound reasons, the Congress has seen fit to require that tens of thousands of our young men serve in the military. We have required that they leave their homes at a time when most of them would be starting on a career or receiving the training which would prepare them for a career. From this demand which we place on our youth evolve certain responsibilities which, I submit, the Congress must assume.

I would like to point out, Mr. President, that our demands on America's young men are not made uniformly. The very promising student who is able to obtain outside financial assistance in the form of a college scholarship is able to postpone his being drafted—if not permanently, then at least until he has completed his college training.

The somewhat less promising youth who is unable to obtain a scholarship—but whose family can nonetheless afford to send him to college—is similarly able to avoid the draft at least temporarily.

In many cases, the chief difference between the student who goes on to college and the student who does not—and is subsequently drafted—is simply having or not having sufficient money.

Thus, the young man who begins the productive period of his life at a financial disadvantage finds himself still further disadvantaged, through no fault of his own, by being taken away from family, friends and occupation so that he may serve his Nation in the Armed Forces. He may be drafted or, knowing that the call to military service is imminent, he may enlist. Either way, when this young man completes his military obligation after several years at low pay, he may—or he may not—have acquired training and skills that will enable him to qualify for a specific vocation. The relevance of many military skills to civilian life is often minimal.

If he does not acquire usable skills, the youth who was drawn into the service initially because he was financially handicapped finds himself still further behind because he has been out of touch for several years with the opportunities

of civilian life. This may well result in a permanent personal disadvantage.

I should like to point out, Mr. President, that our servicemen today and over the past decade have had to prepare to meet any possible contingency of military confrontation. It takes as much skill and courage to put down so-called brushfires in an attempt to keep the general peace as it does on a battlefield at a time of general war. In Vietnam, in the Dominican Republic, in Berlin, in Laos, in other corners of the world, our military men often face peril and many of them are injured or killed in the line of duty. Wherever they are stationed, at home or abroad, their mission is the same—to play their individual roles in maintaining peace or, if necessary, to be this Nation's bulwark against foreign aggression. They are prepared to fulfill this mission, and for this we owe them much.

Add to this obligation, Mr. President, the fact that S. 9 would be a sound national investment and you have a second compelling—if less personal—argument for its adoption.

The two previous acts of this kind taught us that by providing veterans with academic and vocational training, we more than recover our expenditures through the development of the individual's skills and, hence, his increased income and contribution to the general welfare through increased buying power and tax payments.

Under past GI bills, we trained for the Nation 205,000 doctors, dentists, and nurses; 150,000 physical and research scientists; 500,000 engineers; and 350,000 schoolteachers. Additional tax revenues generated by these veterans as a result of their education easily have offset the cost of the previous GI bills.

Since 1955, our Nation's total expenditures on national defense has been nearly \$500 billion. The almost negligible fraction of that amount which we would spend to provide benefits for cold war veterans should be considered as part of our obligation to keep our Nation militarily and economically strong. The individual veteran will benefit—and so will the entire Nation.

When we think of our obligation toward our military men, we call to mind the words of John Mason Brown when he described eloquently the American GI:

Death re-creates an individual out of someone who has fallen singly from the ranks. In his loneliness by a foreign roadside, this man . . . ceases to be Government issue, a mass commodity produced by a mass response out of a mass need and hope. He once again becomes man's issue, and woman's, too.

Yes, Mr. President, we must remember that the American GI is an individual—an individual with hopes and dreams, an individual ready to give his life to defend us all and the land which we cherish and in which freedom prospers. To this individual, this Congress today must say "thank you."

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I am delighted that the cold war GI bill has finally come before the U.S. Senate. As one who has joined him in sponsoring this measure in each of the last three Congresses, I wish to commend the able

and distinguished senior Senator from Texas for his determination and tireless efforts on behalf of this Nation's veterans. I support this bill because I believe it rectifies an injustice to the young men who have served this Nation's defenses since the end of the Korean war but who have not had the opportunities for education and other assistance given to veterans of prior service under the GI bill. Yet, since the end of Korea, these young men have felt the same disruption of lives and ambitions, and have been trained and maintained for battle and run the same risks of injury and death in conflict as veterans of prior years. They face the same problems of readjustment, as those men did. By failing, up to this time, to enact legislation such as this, we have in effect failed to treat them as equals with veterans who served before them. This general inequality was brought home to me in a letter I received from a constituent during the last Congress, who wrote:

The oldest boy, who is now 31, was drafted during the Korean "police action" even though married, and served 2 years in the Army within the United States. After discharge, he availed himself of the opportunities in the GI bill. By dint of hard work and the help of the Government he will in a few weeks be an electrical engineer, a training which he could never afford, nor could I with my responsibilities be able to give him. In addition, he was able to buy a home under the GI bill.

It is quite different with the other two. They both enlisted immediately out of high school for 2 years, one in the Marine Corps, and the other in the Army. The boy in the Army spent most of his time on the borders of East Germany. The Marine was better off—he spent most of his time at Camp Pendleton.

Now the point is this—the two younger boys do not have the benefits that the older one enjoyed even though they did as much for their country as the older one.

Mr. President, I believe that these two young men deserve the same treatment and the benefits we gave their brother. I believe the same should apply to our men in Vietnam, in Berlin, in the Dominican Republic and in the camps and bases throughout this Nation and abroad. For a very large number of these men, the cold war GI bill represents their only hope for an education and for the kind of life which they and thousands like them have helped to protect and defend. I join the cosponsors of this bill in urging the Senate to approve this most important measure.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am most pleased to have this opportunity to express once again my strong support for the cold war GI bill.

This legislation has commanded my strong support ever since I first came to the U.S. Senate. On April 4, 1963, in a statement which I made before the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on behalf of S. 5, I noted that around the world today tens of thousands of young Americans, called from the familiar routine of family, school, and career, are guarding the lives and safety of 185 million of their fellow citizens.

Many of these young men and women, who have served their country so well, face a possible handicap in their future

careers. The Cold War Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1965, now S. 9, is designed to make educational assistance and home loan guarantees available to the 5 million veterans of the cold war similar to that made available to the veterans of World War II and Korea. Justice demands that we enact this legislation during this session of Congress. The proposed bill has always enjoyed strong public support. The need for it has never been greater.

In 1963 when I first testified on this legislation I quoted from a letter written me by an ex-serviceman and young constituent. This young man brought home the meaning of the sacrifices of these cold war servicemen when he wrote: "Although servicemen of today are not engaged in an active shooting war, the demands placed upon them are very similar to those of active conflict. Soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines around the world are daily giving their lives in service to their country. At remote stations in every corner of the globe, the tremendous task of guarding our freedom is being accomplished. In the Berlin crisis and again in the Cuban crisis, our servicemen have demonstrated their ability and willingness to serve the country and deter aggression. Must our Nation become involved in open conflict before recognition, in the form of passage of the cold war GI bill, is given to these men?"

How impressive these remarks appear today in the light of the heavy U.S. commitments in southeast Asia. The total of American dead and wounded rises every day in South Vietnam. It is certainly an injustice to the thousands of young American military men engaged in the conflict there to deny them the same benefits which have been accorded to veterans of the Korean conflict. When these young men return home from southeast Asia they will face similar problems of securing education and employment. The situation is particularly severe for the soldiers of today because of the increased automation which makes finding employment that much more difficult.

I especially wish to support the provisions of this bill for home and farm loan assistance. Loans will be made for the purchase of farm homes, farm lands, and livestock to be used by veterans in farming operations. Direct loans not exceeding \$13,500 may be made to veterans in certain small towns and rural areas when private capital is not available for guarantee loans. A system of institutional onfarm training is established under section 1952 of the bill. Under this authority, many young people from rural farm areas will be afforded the opportunity to attend an institution of higher learning who otherwise would not be able to get a college education. As President Johnson has said, the Great Society cannot be achieved until an adequate higher education is made available to all who desire it.

These farm provisions in particular will be of great benefit to the cold-war veterans of my State. Thousands of South Dakotans are engaged in farming. With the current low levels of farm income it is especially difficult for young

families to become successfully established in the business of farming. The provisions of this bill may well mean the difference between success and failure for many of the young farmers in my State.

S. 9 is very much in the national interest. I earnestly hope that my colleagues in the Senate and House will join in the effort to enact this bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of S. 9, proposing the establishment of a Cold War Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act, I wish to urge immediate passage of this legislation.

During the 86th Congress I cosponsored similar legislation, S. 1138, a cold war GI bill, which passed the Senate but failed of House passage. I cosponsored S. 349 during the 87th Congress, a bill to provide educational benefits for post-Korean conflict draftees and volunteers who served for 6 months since January 31, 1955.

It is my sincere hope that the 88th Congress will see fit to enact S. 9, which the Senate is now debating, so that our Government may provide some of the same equitable and fully deserved readjustment assistance to our cold war veterans as was wisely extended to our American servicemen of World War II and the Korean conflict.

The present bill, S. 9, proposes a cutoff date of July 1, 1967, for the effective period of eligibility for benefits, with the induction period, as defined by the bill, beginning on January 31, 1955. Eligibility for the educational and vocational training assistance and the guaranty and direct loan assistance, as incorporated in the bill, is predicated on discharge from active service under conditions other than dishonorable.

I have on occasion pointed out to the citizens of my State of West Virginia that the funds which the Federal Government has expended in veterans' benefits through education have been among our Nation's wisest and shrewdest investments. Indeed, the tremendous benefits which have accrued to the United States as a result of the enactment of the original GI bill, with all of its provisions for veterans' benefits, have far exceeded the expectations of the original passers of that legislation.

Veterans who have benefited from the GI bill's provisions have substantially raised the economic level of our country and its taxpaying citizenry. In proof of this, the 1960 census showed that nearly 17 million American families were headed by war veterans, and that these families, on a nationwide basis, had a median income of \$6,469 a year, nearly \$1,000 more than the median for the total 45 million U.S. families. And these better educated, higher earning, taxpaying veterans are now funneling approximately \$1 billion annually in income taxes into the Federal Treasury.

In addition to the financial practicalities of the bill, there is the inherent obligation on the part of our Federal Government to deal justly and equitably with all of its citizens.

Young Americans entering military service since January 31, 1955, have made

personal sacrifices in meeting their military obligations. Equity is due them.

Draftees and enlistees now serving in Vietnam's jungles are no less deserving of fair treatment by our Nation than those who served in tropical jungles in World War II.

And how may we expect to explain to those reservists and draftees, who may be at any moment called up to active duty to meet rising demands for U.S. military forces in Vietnam and elsewhere, that we do not feel their service is as deserving as that of those who have been called to our Nation's defense in the past, for this would be what Congress would be saying, in effect, if no action is taken to more nearly equalize by Federal statutes the entitlement of veterans to educational and loan benefits.

In good conscience, last week's headlines, "Joint Chiefs Want Vietnam Force of 179,000 This Year," should be matched in the early future by the headline, "Congress Passes Cold War Veterans' Benefits Bill."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to be a cosponsor of the Cold War Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act, the cold war GI bill.

In my opinion this bill meets a vital need, a need whose urgency is reinforced by every new headline about trouble spots around the world. These headlines emphasize, if any reemphasis is needed, that the cold war is not just an expression, but a somber fact of life.

The cold war GI bill will provide much needed educational and vocational training assistance for veterans of the post-Korean war period. Those eligible will receive monthly allowances for up to 36 months of education or training, based on the length of their time in service.

There would also be vocational rehabilitation training for disabled veterans, and home and farm loan assistance.

I speak today in favor of a program which has already proven itself. The success of the World War II and Korean GI programs is well known. The education features of those programs were particularly important, and made an invaluable contribution to the national welfare.

Nearly 8 million veterans of World War II received training under the first GI bill. Of this total some 450,000 went into communications; 380,000 into highly technical construction work; 100,000 became lawyers; 63,000 physicians; 75,800 farmers; 180,000 mechanics; 238,000 schoolteachers; and 145,000 engineers. Without assistance provided by the original GI bill of rights, many of these men would have been eligible only for low-skill, poorly paid positions. Many would have drifted into unemployment.

In the words of the Bradley Commission:

The veterans' education program was a major contribution to the national welfare, and the country would be weaker educationally, economically, and in terms of national defense if educators, veterans' organizations, the President, and the Congress had not seen fit to embark upon this new and momentous educational enterprise.

Some 5 million post-Korean war veterans will be eligible for assistance under the proposed bill. This includes the most able-bodied, and potentially some of the most productive men in the Nation. Their economic futures and their ability to adjust to the new industrial technology are, I believe, dependent largely upon this bill.

I do not agree with those who say that GI benefits should not be available to so-called peacetime veterans.

We all know that we live in perilous times, when a precarious state of half-war seems to be forever with us. The cold war GI bill is simply a recognition of the present state of the world—when obscure events on distant shores can swiftly transform the garrison soldier into a guarantor of the peace, and the adviser into an active combatant.

Mr. President, I should like here to pay tribute to the work of the able and distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the author of this bill, for his vigorous and effective leadership in the effort to provide readjustment assistance for veterans of military service. I am proud to be part of this effort.

Thomas Jefferson once remarked that we cannot expect freedom and ignorance to coexist together. The men to be eligible for assistance under this bill have contributed mightily to our freedom, and they are daily being called upon to contribute further.

Let us now contribute to their freedom by passing this bill and thus enabling our veterans to better equip themselves for the great challenges that lie ahead.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the Senate has before it one of the most important and far-reaching education measures that it has considered in some years.

The cold war GI bill is a readjustment act. It is intended to set out a balanced program of readjustment assistance for post-Korean veterans. It contains both education and vocational training assistance, as well as guarantee and direct-loan assistance for the purchase of homes and farmlands.

Recent events, such as the conflicts in Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, the Cuban missile crisis and the Berlin call-up, have dictated the continuing need for a large, well-trained military force. We have committed this military force to the preservation of a free Vietnam and Dominican Republic. We have lost men in these conflicts; men who are willingly serving the cause of democracy.

Now we have the opportunity to establish a program that will enable our veterans to more easily readjust from their tour of military duty. The sound economics of this program have been well documented. This country has benefited immeasurably from the World War II and Korean GI bills, in a better-educated and more productive citizenry. And to be very practical, the GI's who took advantage of these opportunities increased their income potential and contributed more in tax revenues than they would have otherwise.

The prospects of another callup of the Reserves and perhaps an extension of

military duty for those now in the Armed Forces, confronts us now. Many will be inconvenienced, some will make the ultimate contribution, should this occur.

We must, Mr. President, be prepared to provide a broad readjustment program for these men and women. We must be willing to show that this Government is concerned with the welfare of its veterans. We must recognize that inequities exist in our selective service process, and provide some balance to even them out.

We have that opportunity now by passing S. 9, and if we are successful I hope that our colleagues in the House will support our efforts.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, America finds itself today in a twilight zone. We are at peace; yet we are not. Our young men are being asked to sacrifice by going into military service by volunteering in large numbers or through the draft in increasing numbers.

We have been told that the President is considering calling some reservists to active duty.

All this is because of international obligations unknown to America and Americans for 160 years. In the period following World War II, we have been thrust into the leadership of a free world whose very foundations are under attack.

We are in a period during which the Trojan horse of sabotage is within every free nation of the world, in which spying and revolutionary plotting has become a way of life by our adversaries. We are in a period when infiltration and attack in so-called wars of liberation have become a way of life in all the backward and emerging nations of the globe.

Our Nation has been drafted into the leadership of the free world—politically, economically and militarily. It is the price we pay collectively for freedom and prosperity, indeed, for our way of life.

Following World War II, the Congress recognized that, for the first time in our history, we had uprooted a vast majority of our young men and women and pressed them into military service. Rather than a handout or pension or bonus, a wise Congress provided for these men and women special benefits to enable them to recoup part of the months and years they have lost in defense of our Nation and its freedom and institutions. Thus, the GI bill put education and homeownership within reach of the average person among the 10 million or so who answered the call.

We, who pioneered free education for all, thus pioneered a new concept—that of college, university, trade school, and special training for all who served their Nation in its Armed Forces. There was, without question, a social and educational revolution in this country which might never have come about.

The same thing is true of home and farm ownership, made easier by the GI bill.

The Korean war brought America the first of its peacetime conflicts in which we sought to honor a commitment to a tiny partner in freedom threatened by invasion, in which we sought to halt the march of communism in Asia.

Since then we have been in the twilight zone about which I have spoken. We draft men. We maintain large armed services. We seek to help defend the honor of freemen all over the globe. Our men and materiel have been offered to the cause in the Congo, in Berlin, in Vietnam. Our men sail in the NATO fleet. They man outposts in all corners of the earth.

The need for the fire department of our armed services is no less today than it was during the Korean war. Nor will the need be diminished at any early date.

What shall we say to these firemen for freedom?

The GI bill now is applicable to those who served prior to January 31, 1955. What of the lives disrupted since?

In equity a grateful nation should provide GI bill benefits to its lukewarm war veterans. This is why I have joined with others in the sponsorship of S. 9 and why I urge its overwhelming passage.

IMMEDIATE ENACTMENT OF COLD WAR GI BILL IS IMPERATIVE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, events of recent months and the prediction of greater escalation of the undeclared war in Vietnam make it even more imperative than ever that the cold war GI bill, S. 9, of which I am co-sponsor, be enacted without delay.

The record should be clear that when the cold war GI bill is enacted into law—and I am more convinced than ever that it is only a matter of time before it is enacted because the need for it grows greater day by day—my colleague, the able and distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] will deserve the appreciation of the many cold war GI's who will benefit from this bill for his untiring and persevering efforts to secure for them this much needed protection.

When Senator YARBOROUGH first introduced this bill in 1957, it could rightly be called the cold war bill of rights. When the bill was passed in 1959 by the Senate, the appellation was still correct.

However, times have changed since then.

We are now involved in a shooting war in Vietnam which seems to be escalating into a ground war as fierce and as destructive of human life as the Korean conflict. Surely if those who fought in the Korean conflict were entitled to the benefits of a GI bill of rights, those who are fighting in Vietnam should be entitled to readjustment assistance, educational and vocational training assistance and loan assistance upon their discharge under conditions other than dishonorable.

By the same token, since any person serving in the armed services during this period could have been sent to Vietnam and, his not being sent is only happen-chance, these benefits should be made available to all serving in the armed services since the termination of the Korean conflict.

I strongly support the early enactment of the now no longer accurately named cold war GI bill of rights. It has the strong endorsement of the AFL-CIO, the American Federation of Teachers,

the National Farmers Union, and many veterans' organizations.

As we call upon the Reserves, the National Guard units, and the draftees to fight in Vietnam in ever-increasing numbers, it would be reassuring to them to know that there is on the statute books a GI bill of rights providing benefits to them when they return.

As I understand the opposition of the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense to this proposed legislation, both these agencies feel that postservice educational programs are likely to lure men from the services. The Reserve units, the National Guard units, and the draftees now being sent to fight in Vietnam cannot be placed in the class of volunteers so that this argument is no longer applicable.

We cannot long delay the enactment of this measure without seriously injuring the morale of those being called up.

Mr. President, I have warmly supported this important legislation from the time of its introduction by Senator YARBOROUGH in past Congresses. I ask unanimous consent that my testimony before this Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare earlier this year be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ERNEST GRUENING, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF ALASKA

Senator GRUENING. Mr. Chairman, whenever I have the opportunity to express my belief that the veterans of this Nation may justifiably be proud of the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, I do. Certainly no other person has worked and continues to work harder to make certain that the men and women who have served or are serving in the armed services of the United States of America receive fair treatment.

Veterans have confidence in this subcommittee; they should. It has been tireless in its quest for the enactment of the cold war GI bill. I concur in its opinion that our veterans should have the opportunity, if they wish, to continue their education which too many times is interrupted by a call to military service.

So once again I urge enactment of the Cold War Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act. I have cosponsored similar bills in the 86th, 87th, 88th, and 89th Congress. Regrettably, with the passing of each year more men and women returning to private life are deprived of the opportunity to advance themselves educationally, professionally, and financially.

The veteran serving in the cold war is discriminated against. He can be drafted under the Universal Military Training and Service Act, an act I consider neither adequate nor fair for in its application it has become dangerously outmoded and discriminatory. Worse, since 1951, it has assumed the status of the "undiscussed sacred cow."

Perhaps we will have the opportunity to modernize our procedures or to abolish this draft entirely. You will recall that on April 18, 1964, President Johnson announced that Secretary of Defense McNamara would undertake a comprehensive review of the military draft. The review was to take 1 year. The time is approaching for a statement of findings, and I hope the 1-year study by the Department of Defense will reveal that the draft can be eliminated and our military forces retained at proper strength with volunteers.

We are not wedded to the Universal Military Training and Service Act, yet each year a large number of our American youth enter military service and give from 2 or more years of their lives to the defense of their country.

Regrettably, only 44 percent of our draft-eligible young men ever serve their country in uniform. These are the men who sacrifice those 2 to 4 years of their lives at the time they would otherwise be in college or beginning their business careers. When they return to civilian life, they are for the most part unskilled, uneducated, and unemployed. I know of no civilian firms which seek as regular employees men with the special skills learned in the jungles of South Vietnam, for example.

Cold wars, as we know, can be very hot. Today's servicemen have no assurance that their tomorrow will come. Already our American dead in South Vietnam exceed 350 and the number of injured is far larger.

The GI bills of earlier years helped more than 10 million veterans, and of that vast number 3,450,000 entered institutions of higher learning; 4,364,000 entered schools below the college level; and 2,656,000 learned skills in on-the-job and on-the-farm training programs. Our Nation, consequently, is far stronger; our economy much improved.

We do grave disservice to our servicemen of today. The bill before the committee is designed to train veterans to enable them to stay off unemployment rolls.

I was disturbed, Mr. Chairman, to learn in reading your article entitled "A Fair Deal for the Cold War Soldier" which appeared in Harper's magazine, that unemployment among veterans discharged since the Korean GI bill lapsed on January 31, 1955, is increasing. More than 2½ million men have been discharged from active duty since January 31, 1955. They deserve better treatment.

More than 210,000 veterans received unemployment compensation in excess of \$96 million. Their unemployment is shocking. Obviously men must be trained if they are to prosper and if they are to contribute to—not detract from—our national economy.

The language of S. 9 will help our veterans. It proposes that veterans receive 1½ days of educational assistance for each day of service, not to exceed 36 months of schooling. The veteran enrolling fulltime in college would be aided by a monthly cash allowance of \$110 if single, \$135 per month if he has one dependent, or \$160 per month if he has more than one dependent. Under terms of the bill, reduced allowances are suggested for part-time schooling or on-the-job or on-the-farm and apprentice training.

The bill offers assistance to young veterans who wish to purchase homes in the city or in the country. I consider this to be desirable, for such a program will bolster many sectors of our economy. Banks or other lenders make loans with Government guaranteeing 60 percent, up to \$7,500, on residential real estate, and 50 percent, up to \$4,000, on non-residential real estate. Direct loans not exceeding \$13,500 may be made to veterans in certain small towns and rural areas when private capital is not available for guarantee loans.

Estimates vary as to the number of new homes which could be constructed were the cold war GI bill to become law, but the figure of 1 million appears conservative. As our population explodes, as our national housing needs increase, we would do well to utilize the tools contained in S. 9.

The cost of the cold war GI bill varies, depending on who is making the estimate; but whether the cost is \$1.5 billion or twice that amount, the investment we make cannot be computed solely in dollars or cents.

In his January 12, 1965, education message to the Congress, President Johnson declared:

"Nothing matters more to the future of our country: not our military preparedness—for armed might is worthless if we lack the brainpower to build a world of peace; not our productive economy—for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower; not our democratic system of government—for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant."

The President pointedly said:

"Nearly half the youths rejected by Selective Service for educational deficiency have fathers who are unemployed or else working in unskilled and low-income jobs."

In my message as Governor of Alaska to the special session of the 17th Assembly of the Alaska Territorial Legislature in 1946, I discussed educational provisions for returning veterans. Part of my message is particularly pertinent today.

I said:

"It is true that it is late. We should have started planning for this some time ago. It will be difficult to get any sort of program in operation with the speed necessary to meet the situation fully, but the longer we delay, the longer we are inactive, the worse will become our dilemma and that of our returning students."

And so today—two decades later—the problem confronts a nation, and it is late.

Back in 1786 Thomas Jefferson in writing to George Wythe discussed the diffusion of knowledge. Jefferson said:

"The most important bill in our whole (Virginia) code is that for the diffusion of knowledge among the people. No other sure foundation can be devised for the preservation of freedom and happiness."

Mr. Chairman, I support S. 9 and urge that this subcommittee report it favorably. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today.

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, as a sponsor of Senate bill 9, the cold war GI bill, I am pleased to address the Senate today in support of this needed legislation. I was privileged earlier, during February 1965, to appear in behalf of this bill before the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

This bill helps thousands of our young servicemen readjust to civilian life upon returning from military service. It allows them to complete their college education or vocational training which enables them to earn a better living.

The bill provides up to 36 months of education and vocational assistance in cash allowances, \$110 a month for single veterans; \$165 for those with dependents. In addition, the program provides for farm and home loan assistance. Veterans with more than 180 days of active service or service-connected disabilities, would be eligible for the program.

Some 3 million cold war veterans would be eligible for assistance under this bill.

All too often, young veterans are untrained and uneducated for a competitive position in an economy which continually demands more and more education and more skills of its workers. This inequity is even harsher when we consider the fact that selective service regulations which permit deferment for college education make it more likely for youths from low income backgrounds to be drafted. Thus, it is often the already disadvantaged who are further penalized by disruption of their lives without any restoration of lost opportunities. Then, upon their return, they find themselves

far behind those in their age group who were allowed to continue their schooling and their careers.

This cold war GI bill in effect provides equality of opportunity to the veteran. The veteran who has sacrificed 2, 3, or 4 years of his life is given an opportunity to catch up with his nonveteran companions whose lives were not disrupted by military service.

Senate bill 9, like the two previous GI bills, is not intended as a bonus bill for combat duty. Neither the World War II nor the Korean GI bills made any distinction between those veterans who served in the front lines and those who served in noncombat stateside jobs. Further, the distinction as to whether the United States is officially at peace is meaningless when American servicemen are being killed and wounded in Vietnam and elsewhere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from

Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 17, as follows:

[No. 192 Leg.]

YEAS—69

Aiken	Hart	Moss
Allott	Hartke	Mundt
Anderson	Hill	Murphy
Bartlett	Inouye	Muskie
Bass	Jackson	Nelson
Bayh	Javits	Pearson
Bible	Jordan, Idaho	Pell
Boggs	Kennedy, Mass.	Prouty
Burdick	Kennedy, N.Y.	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Kuchel	Russell, Ga.
Cannon	Long, Mo.	Russell, S.C.
Case	Long, La.	Scott
Church	Magnuson	Smathers
Clark	Mansfield	Smith
Cotton	McCarthy	Stennis
Dodd	McClellan	Symington
Douglas	McGee	Talmadge
Fannin	McGovern	Tower
Fong	McIntyre	Tydings
Fulbright	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Mondale	Yarborough
Gruening	Montoya	Young, N. Dak.
Harris	Morse	Young, Ohio

NAYS—17

Bennett	Ellender	Robertson
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Cooper	Holland	Simpson
Curtis	Hruska	Thurmond
Dirksen	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Dominick	Morton	

NOT VOTING—14

Brewster	Jordan, N.C.	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Metcalfe	Randolph
Eastland	Miller	Ribicoff
Ervin	Monroney	Sparkman
Hayden	Neuberger	

So the bill (S. 9) as amended, was passed.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I express my thanks, first, to the members of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs who so patiently and diligently came to the long and thorough hearings which were held upon the bill. This applies to the four majority members and to the minority, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], both of Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, to the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I also express my deep gratitude to the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who helped us at every stage of the proceedings in the subcommittee to schedule hearings and to schedule executive meetings, and in the full committee, so that we could report the bill in time to the Senate in order that adequate opportunity would be afforded to enact the bill this year.

I also express my appreciation to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] for the courtesy with which he presented his amendment, and for his fairness and objectivity.

Let me also express my special personal thanks, appreciation, and admiration, to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], for the thoroughness with which he examined and cross-examined witnesses during the hearings on the bill. He showed the complete untenability of the position of those opposed to the bill. As a lawyer with 25 years' practice, I take off my hat to him for his masterly handling of the hearings. He went directly to the point. He did a fine job. I also express my thanks to him for his fine cooperation on the floor during debate on the bill.

I express my thanks and appreciation to the 5 million veterans for their cooperation, as well as to the 41 co-sponsors of the bill and to many other Senators who supported the bill after it was printed and after it was too late to have their names appear as co-sponsors.

I also express my thanks to the overwhelming 2-to-1 majority in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], to the Senator from Michigan, who are on the floor, and to many others.

I express my appreciation also to the junior Senator from Massachusetts, who was active both in the subcommittee and on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I express my thanks also to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who so patiently waited with his amendment in order to expedite all the votes and the passage of the bill. He agreed with the leadership to condense his arguments. He presented those arguments effectively, concisely, and forcefully, and he cooperated with everyone in the final vote today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I congratulate the Senator from Texas on his masterful handling of the bill through the hearings in the subcommittee and on the floor. This is one of the most democratic education bills that we could possibly have passed.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Most of all, Mr. President, I wish to thank the majority leader and his official staff, who have helped us at all times, and have been so diligent in helping us work out accommodations for Senators, some of whom were coming in on planes and some of whom were leaving today. They were helpful in working out unanimous-consent agreements on amendments, in that way saving as much time as could possibly be saved. They have aided the passage of the bill very greatly.

I congratulate them on their skill and cooperation. They have been uniformly courteous and kind to Senators on both sides of the question.

And last but not least, I wish to express my deep personal thanks to the devoted and detailed work of the staff of the Veterans' Subcommittee and of

my own legislative staff. These office staffs have furnished me information, done research, and prepared innumerable reports, memorandums and suggestions. Without their help this bill could not possibly have progressed this far in this period of time.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] on the way in which he handled the Cold War Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act and on the work that went into it.

One of the joys of our service as Senators in achieving an objective is taking part in the translation of ideas into events.

Over many years the Senator from Texas has worked on an idea and developed it, and watered and nourished it, and then today saw it translated into an actual flowering and accomplishment. What he has achieved today will be of inestimable benefit to millions of our young men.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Texas on the fine work he did in managing the bill from beginning to end. It was a pleasure to sit with him as he presided over the hearings and developed the record which was instrumental in moving the bill through committee, to the present floor action.

It was a pleasure to participate in floor debate with him and to watch him demonstrate his mastery of the issues as he answered all questions put to him. It was a pleasure to support him in this entire effort. He deserves the appreciation of all of us today.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator from New York for his kind remarks.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the passage of S. 9, the so-called cold war GI bill, represents the culmination of many years of effort in this field by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. His handling of this bill has been masterful; his arguments succinct as well as persuasive.

In like manner I wish to commend the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], and the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] whose constructive criticism of this bill was presented in their amendments. The cooperation of these Members as well as the Senate as a whole renews my growing optimism that we may complete our work by Labor Day.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for his generous remarks and for the tremendous assistance which he rendered during the consideration of the bill.

THE SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, today I issued a press release on our recent policy in the Dominican Republic. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

After hearing the testimony this morning in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, said of our recent policy in the Dominican Republic:

"The major impression I have formed to date from the hearings on the Dominican Republic crisis is that the United States can be counted upon to continue its mistaken policy of supporting military juntas in Latin America.

"I am afraid that any attempt on the part of the masses of the people in any Latin American country where conflict exists between military leaders who wish to enlarge their military power, and civilian leaders who are seeking greater self-government by the people, will result in the United States being found on the side of the military.

"The propaganda alibi will be that our course of action is necessary to put down communism. I want to see communism defeated, too, but it must be done through our helping the people develop economic freedom and not through our support of military dictatorships.

"Bullets will not defeat communism, but bread will."

TEACHING PROFESSIONS ACT OF 1965—INTRODUCTION OF BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that tonight on my own behalf and for the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], that I introduce the Teaching Professions Act of 1965 which the President of the United States on July 17 recommended to the Congress for consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the President dated July 17, 1965, the text of the letter to the President of the Senate, dated July 17, 1965, an explanation of provisions and the text of the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, statement, letter, and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2302) to provide fellowships for elementary and secondary school personnel, to improve the quality of teacher training programs, and to establish a National Teacher Corps, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2302

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Teaching Professions Act of 1965."

PART A—FELLOWSHIPS AND TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL PERSONNEL

Award of fellowships authorized

SEC. 2. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to support fellowship programs for persons who have recently received a bachelor's degree or its equivalent and who desire to pursue a career in elementary or secondary education, for persons in another career or activity who desire to enter or re-enter upon

a career in elementary or secondary education, and for persons who are pursuing a career in elementary or secondary education but who desire to improve their qualifications or to acquire qualifications in a different aspect of elementary or secondary education. These fellowships may be awarded for graduate study in any field which has as its purpose assisting or improving elementary or secondary education. Fellowships awarded under this part shall be for periods of study not in excess of two calendar years and shall be awarded only for the use of persons who have been accepted into programs approved pursuant to section 3(a).

(b) In supporting fellowship programs under the provisions of this part, the Commissioner shall endeavor to provide an equitable distribution of such fellowships throughout the States, except that after consultation with the Advisory Council on Teacher Preparation he may establish priorities which take into consideration particular qualifications of persons who may receive fellowships, their proposed field of study, and the nature of the service they intend to provide in elementary or secondary education.

Approval of programs; grants

SEC. 3. (a) The Commissioner shall approve a graduate program of an institution of higher education only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding—

(1) that such program will substantially further the objective of improving the quality of education of persons who are pursuing or intend to pursue a career in elementary or secondary education,

(2) that such program gives major emphasis to high-quality substantive courses,

(3) that such program is of high quality and either is in effect or will be attainable as a result of granting fellowships under this part for study in the program, and

(4) that only persons who demonstrate a serious intent to pursue or to continue to pursue a career in elementary or secondary education will be accepted for study in the program.

(b) For the purpose of obtaining an appropriate geographical distribution of high-quality programs for the training of personnel for elementary and secondary education, the Commissioner is authorized, on such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, to make grants to and contracts with institutions of higher education to pay part of the cost of developing or strengthening graduate programs which meet the requirements of subsection (a) and of developing or strengthening high-quality undergraduate programs for the training of such personnel. The Commissioner may employ experts and consultants, as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), to advise him with respect to the making of grants and contracts under this subsection, and he shall set forth in regulations the standards and priorities which will be utilized in approving such grants and contracts. Experts and consultants employed pursuant to this subsection may be compensated while so employed at rates not in excess of \$100 per diem, including travel time, and may be allowed, while away from their homes or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Fellowship stipends; conditions

SEC. 4. (a) The Commissioner shall pay to persons awarded fellowships under this part such stipends (including allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such members and their dependents) as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs.

(b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a), the Commissioner shall pay to the institution of higher education at which such person is pursuing his course of study \$2,500 per academic year or its equivalent (as determined under regulations of the Commissioner), less any amount charged such person for tuition.

(c) A person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this part shall continue to receive the payments provided in subsection (a) only during such periods as the institution he is attending finds that he is maintaining satisfactory proficiency in, and devoting essentially full time to study or research in a program approved pursuant to section 3(a), and is not engaging in gainful employment other than incidental employment by such institution in teaching, research, or similar activities which are considered a part of his training.

(d) No fellowship shall be awarded under this part for study at a school or department of divinity. For the purposes of this subsection, the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution or department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

PART B—NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

Statement of purpose

SEC. 10. The purpose of this part is to strengthen the educational opportunities available to children in areas having high concentrations of low-income families by making available to local educational agencies teachers who are qualified to participate in programs and projects approved under title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, and to encourage more highly trained and broadly prepared persons to pursue careers in elementary and secondary education by—

(1) attracting and training experienced and qualified teachers who will be made available to local educational agencies to participate in such programs and projects; and

(2) attracting and training inexperienced teacher-interns who will be made available to participate in such programs and projects in teams led by an experienced teacher.

Establishment of National Teacher Corps

SEC. 11. In order to carry out the purposes of this part, there is hereby established in the Office of Education, for the benefit of the several States, a National Teacher Corps, hereafter in this part referred to as the "Teacher Corps."

Teacher Corps program

SEC. 12. (a) For the purpose of carrying out this part, the Commissioner is authorized to—

(1) establish procedures for the recruitment, selection, and enrollment of experienced teachers, and teacher-interns who have a bachelor's degree or its equivalent but who have no experience as teachers, in the Teacher Corps for periods of up to two years;

(2) enter into arrangements, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education and with State educational agencies to provide members of the Teacher Corps with appropriate training before they undertake their teaching duties under this part;

(3) enter into arrangements, including the payment of the administrative costs of such arrangements, with State educational agencies and, where appropriate, with participating institutions of higher education designated for this purpose by the State educational agency, to furnish members of the Teacher Corps to local educational agencies, for participation during regular or summer

sessions, or both, in programs and projects approved under title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended; and

(4) employ experts and consultants or organizations thereof to assist the Commissioner in carrying out his functions under this part, as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and to compensate individuals while so employed at rates not in excess of \$100 per diem, including travel time, and allow them, while away from their homes or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner determines that the demand for the services of experienced teachers or of teaching teams furnished pursuant to clause (3) of subsection (a) exceeds the number of experienced teachers or teaching teams available from the Teacher Corps, the Commissioner shall, to the extent practicable, allocate experienced teachers or teaching teams, as the case may be, from the Teacher Corps among the States in proportion to the number of children in each State counted for making basic grants under title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, for the fiscal year for which the allocation is made.

(c) To the extent consistent with law, a local educational agency shall utilize members of the Teacher Corps assigned to it in providing, on an equitable basis and in the manner described in section 205(a)(2) of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, educational services in which children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools can participate.

Teacher-interns

SEC. 13. (a) Teacher-interns who serve in the Teacher Corps shall be assigned in teaching teams, each team consisting of teacher-interns and one or more experienced teachers who so far as practicable shall also be members of the Teacher Corps. The Commissioners shall provide, through grants to or contracts with institutions of higher education and State educational agencies, programs of teacher training for all such teacher-interns. Such programs shall offer to teacher-interns one or more courses of training each of which shall be under the supervision of an institution of higher education and shall, wherever possible, lead to a graduate degree at the end of the teacher-intern's enrollment in the Teacher Corps. Such programs shall involve teaching, on less than a full-time basis and under the supervision of experienced teachers who are, so far as is practicable, enrolled in the Teacher Corps, in programs or projects approved under title II of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended.

(b) The Commissioner shall enroll as teacher-interns only applicants who indicate in writing an intention to serve in elementary or secondary education for a period of at least two years after the termination of their enrollment in the Teacher Corps.

Compensation; stipends

SEC. 14. (a) An arrangement made with a local educational agency pursuant to clause (3) of section 12(a) shall provide for compensation by such agency of Teacher Corps members at a rate which is equal to the rate paid by such agency for a teacher who has similar training and experience and who has been assigned similar teaching duties.

(b) For any period of training under this part the Commissioner shall pay to members of the Teacher Corps such stipends (including allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such members and their dependents) as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable Federally supported training programs.

(c) The Commissioner shall pay the necessary travel expenses of members of the Teacher Corps and their dependents, necessary expenses for the transportation of the household goods and personal effects of such members and their dependents, and such other necessary expenses of members as are directly related to their service in the Corps, including readjustment allowances proportionate to service.

(d) The Commissioner is authorized to make such arrangements as may be possible, including the payment of any costs incident thereto, to protect the tenure, retirement rights, participation in a medical insurance program, and such other similar employee benefits as the Commissioner deems appropriate, of a member of the Teacher Corps who participates in any program under this part and who indicates his intention to return to the school, or educational agency or institution, by which he was employed immediately prior to his service under this part.

Application of provisions of Federal law

SEC. 15. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this section, a member of the Teacher Corps shall not, solely because he is such a member, be deemed to be a Federal employee or be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

(b) (1) During periods of full-time training, such members shall, for the purposes of the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (5 U.S.C. 751 et seq.), be deemed to be civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term "employee" as defined in section 40 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 790) and the provisions thereof shall apply except as hereinafter provided.

(2) For purposes of this subsection:

(A) the term "performance of duty" in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall not include any act of a member of the Teacher Corps—

(i) while on authorized leave; or

(ii) while absent from his assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity authorized by or under the direction or supervision of the Commissioner; and

(B) in computing compensation benefits for disability or death under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the monthly pay of a member of the Teacher Corps shall be deemed to be his actual pay or that received under the entrance salary for grade 6 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, whichever is greater.

(c) During periods of full-time training, such members shall be deemed to be employees of the Government for the purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions of title 28, United States Code.

Local control preserved

SEC. 16. Members of the Teachers Corps shall be under the direct supervision of the appropriate officials of the local educational agencies to which they are assigned. Except as otherwise provided in section 13, such agencies shall retain the authority to—

(1) assign such members within their systems;

(2) make transfers within their systems;

(3) determine the subject matter to be taught;

(4) determine the term and continuance of the assignment of such members within their systems.

PART C—GENERAL

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 20. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act \$30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the four succeeding fiscal years.

Advisory Council on Teacher Preparation

SEC. 21. (a) The Commissioner shall establish in the Office of Education an Advisory Council on Teacher Preparation for the purpose of reviewing the administration and operation of the programs carried out under this Act and of all other Federal programs for complementary purposes. This review shall pay particular attention to the effectiveness of these programs in attracting, preparing, and retaining highly qualified elementary and secondary school teachers, and it shall include recommendations for the improvement of these programs. The Council shall consist of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, and twelve members appointed for staggered terms and without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Such twelve members shall include persons knowledgeable with respect to teacher preparation and the needs of urban and rural schools, and representatives of the general public.

(b) Members of such Advisory Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while attending meetings or conferences of such Council or otherwise engaged on business of such Council, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding \$100 per diem, including traveltime, and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(c) The Council may appoint an Executive Secretary and such other employees as the Council deems necessary to carry out its functions under this part.

Federal administration

SEC. 22. (a) The Commissioner may delegate any of his functions under this Act except the making of regulations to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

(b) In administering the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

Method of payment

SEC. 23. Payments under this Act to any person, to any State or Federal agency, to any institution of higher education, or to any other organization, pursuant to a grant, contract, or other arrangement may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustment on account of overpayments or underpayments.

Federal control of education prohibited

SEC. 24. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

Limitation on payments under this Act

SEC. 25. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize the making of any payment under this Act for religious worship or instruction.

Definitions

SEC. 26. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(b) The term "elementary school" means a school which provides elementary educa-

tion including education below grade 1, as determined under State law.

(c) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or that recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association approved by the Commissioner for this purpose or, if not so accredited, (A) is an institution with respect to which the Commissioner has determined that there is satisfactory assurance, considering the resources available to the institution, the period of time (if any) during which it has operated, the effort it is making to meet accreditation standards, and the purpose for which this determination is being made, that the institution will meet the accreditation standards of such an agency or association within a reasonable time, or (B) is an institution whose credits are accepted on transfer by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

(d) The term "local educational agency" means a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary schools. Such term also includes any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school.

(e) The term "nonprofit" as applied to a school means a school owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(f) The term "secondary school" means a school which provides secondary education, as determined under State law, except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12.

(g) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(h) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States of the Union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands.

(i) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law.

The statement, letter, and explanation presented by Mr. MORSE are as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Like many of my fellow Americans, I believe that this land's most noble enterprise is the work of education; that, in our Nation's classrooms, our future is being built. And I believe that the chief architects of that future are the teachers of America.

Today I have completed work upon a legislative proposal which is a testament to those beliefs: the Teaching Professions Act of 1965. It is now on its way to the Congress.

Today in the United States there are 1,800,000 teachers in elementary and secondary schools. By this fall we will need 193,000 new teachers merely to accommodate growing enrollments and to replace teachers who retire and leave the profession. We will need nearly 2 million new teachers in the next 10 years.

Yet our needs cannot be expressed in numbers. Tomorrow's teachers must not merely be plentiful enough; they must be good enough. They must possess not only the old virtues of energy and dedication, but new knowledge and new skill. And if we are to have the best available teachers, we must attract to teaching the best available students.

Today almost 5 percent of our teachers—85,000—lack adequate certification. Almost 10 percent have less than a bachelor's degree; only 25 percent have a master's degree.

Our Nation, whose needs are so immense and whose wealth is so great, can do better. We must do better. And this act offers a way to begin.

The Teaching Professions Act of 1965 will establish, first, a National Teachers Corps. Members of the Corps—experienced teachers and students who plan to make teaching a career—would go together to the city slums and to rural areas of poverty to offer what these troubled regions need most: light and learning; help—and hope.

Second, the act will create a program of fellowships to prepare superior students for teaching careers in elementary and secondary schools and to help teachers renew their knowledge and skills. The Federal Government already assists men and women making their careers in college teaching. Now is the time to do the same for those who serve at the elementary and secondary school levels.

Finally, this act will provide direct assistance to institutions of higher learning so that they may develop better programs for teacher education. The Teaching Professions Act of 1965 is a composite of hard thinking about educational problems in the Congress, in the executive branch, and in the teaching profession. It owes much to the proposals of Senators GAYLORD NELSON and EDWARD KENNEDY for a National Teachers Corps; to Senators WAYNE MORSE and CLIFFORD CASE and Representatives CARL PERKINS and JOHN BRADEMAs for a program of fellowships for teachers; and to Representative PATSY MINK for a program of Federal grants to teachers for sabbatical leaves.

I am calling upon the Congress to make this beginning even though it is well along in its present session. The problems confronting us in education do not diminish with the passage of time; neither should our zeal for solving those problems. This act may be just a beginning; but now is the time to begin.

Henry Adams said, "A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops." This act, I believe, will have an eternal influence on this Nation.

JULY 17, 1965.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As I announced in my remarks before the National Education Association on July 2, I am proposing legislation to bring the best of our Nation's talent to its schools. This legislation—the Teaching Professions Act of 1965—will:

Create a National Teacher Corps to serve in city slums and areas of rural poverty;

Establish a program of fellowships to prepare students for teaching careers in elementary and secondary education and to help experienced teachers enhance their qualifications;

Aid institutions of higher education to provide better programs for educating teachers.

The National Teacher Corps draws on that spirit of dedication of Americans which has been demonstrated time and again in peace and war, by young and old, at home and abroad. It will provide a challenge and an opportunity for teachers with a sense of mission—those best suited to the momentous tasks this Nation faces in improving education.

The National Teacher Corps can help improve the quality of teaching where quality is most needed and most often in short supply—in city slums and in areas of rural poverty. It will enroll experienced teachers, and, to work with them, students who intend to make teaching a career. They will teach in local schools at the request of local communities and will serve on the same terms as local teachers. They will be local, not Federal, employees.

The fellowships are essential if teaching is to attract a higher proportion of our ablest young people, and if the best teaching is to prevail in the classroom. Students preparing for teaching in these days should have superior graduate training. Teaching is a difficult job at best; the more preparation for it, the better.

The desire of classroom teachers to replenish their skills and knowledge is not only to be applauded but aided. As revolutionary changes take place in all subjects and at all levels of learning, there is a limit to the sacrifice we can ask of our teachers in their efforts to renew their knowledge.

Finally, I propose a program of grants to help institutions of higher education offer first-rate programs to would-be teachers as well as to experienced teachers. This measure, coupled with the fellowship program and the National Teacher Corps, completes a program which is entitled to be called the Teaching Professions Act of 1965.

The Teaching Professions Act of 1965 is a composite of hard thinking about educational problems in the Congress, in the executive branch, and in the teaching profession. It owes much to the proposals of Senators GAYLORD NELSON and EDWARD KENNEDY for a national teacher corps; to Senators WAYNE MORSE and CLIFFORD CASE and Representatives CARL PERKINS and JOHN BRADEMAs for a program of fellowships for teachers; and to Representative PATSY MINK for a program of Federal grants to teachers for sabbatical leaves.

This bill will deepen the meaning and substance of the already impressive work of the 88th and 89th Congresses in the field of education. I have concluded that it is of sufficient urgency to justify action by this session of the Congress. The problems which face us in education do not grow smaller as time goes by; neither should our determination to attack and solve those problems. I commend to you the Teaching Professions Act of 1965, and hope that you will give it speedy consideration.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

OUTLINE OF PROVISIONS OF THE TEACHING PROFESSIONS ACT OF 1965

The newly proposed "Teaching Professions Act of 1965" would carry out the President's proposals, first announced in his July 2 speech before the National Education Association's Convention in New York City, to establish a program of fellowships for elementary and secondary school personnel and to create a National Teacher Corps.

The legislation would authorize the Commissioner of Education to support fellowship programs carried out by institutions of higher education for recent baccalaureate recipients, for persons in other careers desiring to pursue a career in elementary or secondary education, and for persons in elementary and secondary education desiring to improve their qualifications or to acquire qualifications in a different aspect of elementary and secondary education.

Fellowships would be awarded for up to 2 years of graduate study in approved high-quality graduate programs which give major emphasis to substantive courses and are designed for persons pursuing careers in elementary and secondary education.

In addition to stipends for fellowship holders, a cost-of-education allowance of \$2,500 would be paid to the institution of higher education at which each such fellowship holder is studying.

The Commissioner of Education would also be authorized to pay to institutions of higher education part of the cost of developing or strengthening high quality graduate and undergraduate programs for the training of personnel for elementary and secondary education, for the purpose of obtaining an appropriate geographical distribution of such programs.

The bill would establish in the Office of Education a National Teacher Corps in which experienced teachers and teacher-interns who have a bachelor's degree but who have had no teaching experience would enroll for periods of up to 2 years. Members of the Teacher Corps would, pursuant to arrangements with State educational agencies and, where appropriate, with institutions of higher education designated by the State educational agency, be furnished to local educational agencies in areas having high concentrations of low-income families to participate in programs and projects approved under title II of Public Law 874 (title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965).

Before undertaking their teaching duties, all members of the Teacher Corps would be provided training under arrangements which the Commissioner of Education would enter into, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education and with State educational agencies. The Commissioner would likewise provide, through grants to or contracts with institutions of higher education and State educational agencies, in-service teachers training programs for teacher-interns, who would teach on less than a full-time basis in order to have time for training courses under the supervision of an institution of higher education. Such courses would, wherever possible, lead to a graduate degree at the end of the teacher-intern's enrollment in the Teacher Corps.

Teacher-interns joining the Teacher Corps would be assigned in teaching teams which would also include experienced teachers, and the teaching program for teacher-interns would be under the supervision of experienced teachers. Insofar as practicable, such experienced teachers would be teachers who are enrolled in the Teacher Corps.

Arrangements for furnishing Teacher Corps members to local educational agencies must provide that such agency will compensate Teacher Corps members at the rate of pay for a teacher who has similar training and experience and similar teaching duties.

Stipends (including substance allowances) would be paid to members of the Teacher Corps by the Commissioner of Education during periods of training when Teacher Corps members are not on assignment with a local educational agency. The Federal Government would pay travel expenses and readjustment allowances before and after Teacher Corps members undertake

their duties in the areas where they will be teaching. In addition, the Federal Government could make payments necessary to protect retirement rights, medical insurance, and other employee benefits for experienced teachers who expect to return to the schools where they were employed before joining the corps.

Members of the Teacher Corps could be utilized by local educational agencies to provide educational services in which children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools can participate, in the manner described in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The legislation guarantees that members of the Teacher Corps would be under the direct supervision and control of local educational agencies to which they are assigned.

While the bill authorizes the furnishing of teachers and teaching teams in the corps to all local educational agencies with programs for low-income children which State educational agencies approve under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, if the demand for the services of such teachers should exceed the number available from the Teacher Corps, the Commissioner of Education would be directed to allocate them among the States (to the extent practicable) in proportion to the number of low-income children in each State which are counted for State-by-State distribution of basic grants under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The appropriations authorization for both programs is limited to \$30 million in this fiscal year (1965-66).

An Advisory Council on Teacher Preparation would be established in the Office of Education to review both the fellowship and Teacher Corps programs, as well as other programs bearing on the improvement of teacher preparation programs in the Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have asked that the material be spread upon the RECORD in order that all Senators may have the opportunity to review the details outlined in the draft bill so that they may, if they wish, join with me and my distinguished colleagues on the committee in cosponsoring the measure.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill I am introducing lie at the desk until the close of business, Friday, July 23, to enable Senators who wish to do so to add their names.

Mr. President, I wish again to express my delight that the administration is in support of the basic concepts, both the teaching corps and the fellowship components, which many of us have for some time been advocating. Hearings on the concepts have been held by the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on June 11 so that there is a strong body of evidence in our hearings record which can be utilized in the evaluation of the specifics both of the bill being introduced and the amendments to S. 600 which were introduced by Senator NELSON for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and myself Friday last.

In our executive sessions in this week we can now have before us the thinking of the administration as well as that of the Senatorial cosponsors on the mechanism through which the concepts can operate. I feel sure that none of us is wedded to the language either of this bill or of our previously introduced amendments. Our objective, however, remains now as it was earlier, to do the best job we can in drafting language

which can best carry out the purpose and trust of the Teaching Professions Act of 1965. It is my hope that we can incorporate these concepts as a separate title of S. 600.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

NOMINATION OF DR. ROBERT M. WHITE TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I was pleased and proud to learn that President Johnson has nominated Dr. Robert M. White to be the first Administrator of the newly created Environmental Science Services Administration.

Dr. White brings to his new position a wealth of experience in the field of the environmental sciences. As Chief of the Weather Bureau and as president of the Travelers Research Center in Hartford, Conn., he has proven himself to be both an able administrator and an eminent scientist.

The ESSA will serve a real need in consolidating in one service the efforts of the Weather Bureau and the Coast and Geodetic Survey. It will focus attention on the long-overdue acknowledgment of the essential unity of the environmental sciences.

As we make spectacular breakthroughs in our space efforts, there will be very important new developments in our knowledge of the physical world in which we live, the oceans around us, and the space above us. It is good to know that a man of Dr. White's energy and talent will be directing for the benefit of our people the application of this new knowledge.

And so, I salute the President for this very fine nomination and I congratulate Dr. White for this well-deserved recognition of his talent and for his dedication to his science and to his country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent article from the New York Times describing Dr. White's distinguished career.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 13, 1965]

TOP U.S. WEATHERMAN: ROBERT MAYER WHITE

WASHINGTON, July 12—A friend who knew Dr. Robert M. White, the Nation's top weatherman, as a boy in Boston said his most vivid memory is of someone "energetically striding up the street." Dr. White has not slowed down since, even when he wrote a thesis for his doctorate of science at Massachusetts Institute of Technology entitled "Global Energy Balance." A reporter who interviewed him in his Weather Bureau office a few moments ago said:

"He was moving rapidly all the time he was talking."

Now the Weather Bureau was merged today with the Coast and Geodetic Survey and an atmospheric radio laboratory into the new Environmental Science Services Administration—largely a creature of Dr. White's own making.

HAS A QUIET MANNER

Dr. White is 42 years old, a dark-haired, brown-eyed man of medium height with a

quiet manner and a quick smile. His most outstanding characteristic, other than giving the impression of perpetual motion, seems to be the ability to make others want to work with him.

He took over the Weather Bureau on October 1, 1963, following a man who had directed it for more than 24 years. Since then he has reorganized the Bureau and conceived and shepherded the plan for the new agency through a governmental process that he once called "far more complex than I had thought."

Like Dr. White's thesis and his approach to the physical sciences that govern the weather, the new agency will be global in its outlook.

He has been quoted as saying that meteorology "is on threshold of a revolution"—largely a technological one made possible by statistical methods, computers and satellites that have revolutionized man's ability to observe the atmosphere.

Dr. White has grown up with this revolution. His early interest in geology shifted to meteorology when he was assigned as a weather observer by the Air Force in 1962.

He received a bachelor of arts degree from Harvard University in geology in 1944, left the service in July, and took a detour into journalism and advertising until 1948.

Then he entered MIT, earning a master of science degree in meteorology in 1949 and his doctorate the next year.

From 1950 until 1959 he studied large-scale circulations of the atmosphere as a civilian scientist for the Air Force's Cambridge Research Center near Boston. It was here that he developed the administrative talents that led a fellow scientist to call him "one of the best administrators in Government."

Dr. White returned to MIT briefly as a research associate in 1959 and then became head of the new Travelers Weather Research Center at Hartford.

The center was established by the Travelers Insurance Co. to find ways to predict and warn of storms and hurricanes.

This interest has carried over into a desire to give the new agency what President Johnson called an ability to develop an adequate warning system for the severe hazards of nature—for hurricanes, tornados, floods, earthquakes and seismic sea waves, which have proved so disastrous to the Nation in recent years.

Dr. White also has a strong interest in weather modification, an old dream that now holds some promise of coming true.

TEN-HOUR-A-DAY MAN

He is a 10-hour-a-day man at the office and sometimes a two briefcase man when he takes work home. He lived in apartments until he moved to a house in Connecticut, but there he discovered a love for flower gardening.

Dr. White is married to the former Mavis Seagle, and they have two children, Richard, 7, and Edwina, 5. They live now in a Maryland suburb of Washington. One of his two brothers is Theodore H. White, the author.

In Dr. White's whirlwind approach, very little time is left for raising gladioluses and dahlias, but he takes every opportunity he can.

"He just goes ahead when he has time," Mrs. White said. "When he gets wet, he gets wet. He doesn't take much notice of the weather."

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF DISNEYLAND

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I rise in tribute to a great American—and a close personal friend of many Members of this body—who yesterday celebrated the 10th anniversary of an accomplish-

ment which has endeared him to all America and to millions of our friends around the world as well.

That man is Walt Disney—and the accomplishment is Disneyland in my home State of California.

Yesterday brought the total number of visitors to Disneyland to almost 50 million. Kings and queens, 23 presidents, premiers, and other heads of state plus 25 royal princes and princesses have visited Disneyland making it one of the most popular attractions in the history of the world.

It is more than a park—more than a collection of clever amusements created and welded together from the genius of Walt Disney. It is Americana—from Frontier Land, down Main Street and into Fantasy Land and Tomorrow Land.

Regardless of age, visitors are more than entertained at Disneyland. They are awed, educated, and inspired. They learn about history, art, geography, space, and industry.

It is comforting to know that in an age of concern for moral erosion, the popularity and success of Disneyland serves to prove that creativeness, cleanliness, and courtesy still promise overwhelming success.

Walt Disney has also given his great talents to the Government of the United States graciously and effectively in fairs, exhibits, and, of course, in films and television. He has been for many years one of the best known and highly respected and honored Americans of all time. He has been honored by 21 foreign governments.

I know that the distinguished Members of the U.S. Senate join with me in saluting Walt Disney and Disneyland—two great American institutions.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am delighted to join my friend and colleague from California in saluting a unique American genius, Walt Disney, whose magic has delighted the whole world.

My hometown is Anaheim. I was born there, and I have lived there all my life.

When I say to my friends in the east that I live in Anaheim, and they do not quite understand, I say, "That is where Disneyland is located." Then they do know where my home is.

This is a unique undertaking that Walt Disney has created. Therefore, the 50 million people who have come to see the Disney magic are an indication of many more millions who will come there in the future.

I am glad to join my colleague from California in saluting a wonderful and great man, Walt Disney.

STATE TECHNICAL SERVICES ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 406, S. 949.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill S. 949 to promote the economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to

place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments on page 1, line 5, after the word "in", to insert "business, commerce, and"; on page 2, line 2, after the word "American", to strike out "business and enterprise." and insert "business, enterprise, commerce, and industrial establishments."; in line 9, after the word "established", to insert "business, commerce, and industrial establishments."; in line 19, after the word "enable", to strike out "businesses and industries" and insert "businesses, commerce, and industrial establishments."; on page 3, line 11, after the word "Designated", to strike out "institution" and insert "agency"; in line 25, after the word "this", to strike out "Act," and insert "subsection"; on page 4, line 23, after "Sec. 3.", to strike out "Any" and insert "The Governor or other competent authority of any"; on page 5, line 5, after the word "Act.", to strike out:

If the institution or agency designated by each State is not a State university or land-grant college entitled to benefits under the Act approved July 2, 1862, or the Act of August 30, 1890, and Acts amendatory and supplementary thereto (7 U.S.C. 301, 329), the Governor or other competent State authority shall furnish the Secretary a written statement of his reasons for designating such other institution or agency.

In line 13, after the word "designated", to strike out "institution" and insert "agency"; in line 19, after the word "region", to strike out "its industry," and insert "business, commerce, and"; on page 6, line 18, after the word "designated", to strike out "institution" and insert "agency"; on page 7, line 4, after the word "designated", to strike out "institution" and insert "agency"; in line 11, after the word "State", to insert "other"; in line 13, after the word "service", to strike out "performed" and insert "that is now available or could be made available"; in line 18, after the word "company", to insert "public work or other capital project"; in line 20, after the word "the", to insert "industry and commerce of the"; on page 8, line 5, after the word "designated", to strike out "institution" and insert "agency"; on page 9, at the beginning of the line, strike out "Sec. 9" and insert "Sec. 9(a)"; after line 14, to insert:

(b) The right to alter, amend, or repeal this section, or any consent granted pursuant to this section, is expressly reserved.

In line 19, after the word "designated", to strike out "institution" and insert "agency"; in line 20, after the word "shall", to strike out "establish" and insert "appoint"; on page 10, line 3, after the word "designated", to strike out "institution" and insert "agency"; after line 6, to strike out:

SEC. 11. There is authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be needed to carry out the purposes set forth in this section.

And insert in lieu thereof:

SEC. 11. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this Act, \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; \$30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; \$40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; and \$40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

In line 18, after the word "designated", to strike out "institution" and insert "agency"; on page 11, line 1, after "(2)", to strike out "commerce," and insert "commercial"; in line 7, after the word "designated", to insert "agency"; in line 24, after the word "designated", to strike out "institution" and insert "agency"; on page 12, line 14, after the word "Act.", to strike out:

There is authorized to be appropriated each fiscal year such amount as may be necessary to provide the services authorized in this section.

On page 13, at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "Sec. 16." and insert "Sec. 16(a)", and in the same line, after the word "designated", to strike out "institution" and insert "agency"; on page 14, after line 2, to insert:

(b) The Secretary shall make a complete report with respect to the administration of this Act to the President and the Congress not later than January 31 following the end of each fiscal year for which amounts are appropriated pursuant to this Act.

In line 10, after the word "any", to insert "agency or"; in line 12, after the word "the", to insert "agency or"; in line 16, after the word "the", to insert "agency or"; in line 20, after the word "such", to insert "agency or"; in line 24, after the word "such", to insert "agency or"; on page 15, line 3, after the word "any", to insert "agency or"; in line 6, after the word "such", to insert "agency or"; at the beginning of line 8, to insert "agency or"; and to amend the title so as to read: "A bill to promote commerce and encourage economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. That Congress finds that wider diffusion and more effective application of science and technology in business, commerce, and industry are essential to the growth of the economy, to higher levels of employment, and to the competitive position of United States products in world markets. The Congress also finds that the benefits of federally financed research, as well as other research, must be placed more effectively in the hands of American business, enterprise, commerce, and industrial establishments. The Congress further finds that the several States through cooperation with universities, communities, and industries can contribute significantly to these purposes by providing technical services designed to encourage a more effective application of science and technology to both new and established business, commerce, and industrial establishments. The Congress, therefore, declares that the purpose of this Act is to provide a national program of incentives and support for the several States individually and in cooperation with each other in their establish-

ing and maintaining State and regional technical service programs designed to achieve these ends.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—
(a) "Technical services" means activities or programs designed to enable businesses, commerce, and industrial establishments to acquire and use scientific and engineering information more effectively through such means as—

(1) analyzing problems of the regions and industries to determine new opportunities for applying technology;

(2) preparing and disseminating technical reports, abstracts, computer tapes, microfilm, reviews, and similar scientific or engineering information, including the establishment of State or regional technical information centers for this purpose;

(3) providing a reference service to identify sources of engineering and other scientific expertise; and

(4) sponsoring industrial workshop, seminars, training programs, extension courses, demonstrations, and field visits designed to encourage the more effective application of scientific and engineering information.

(b) "Designated agency" means the institution or agency in each participating State, which has been designated as administrator of the program for such State under section 3 of this Act.

(c) "Qualified institution" means (1) an institution of higher learning with a program leading to degrees in engineering or business administration which is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association to be listed by the United States Commissioner of Education, or such an institution which is listed separately after evaluation by the United States Commissioner of Education pursuant to this subsection; or (2) a State agency or a private, nonprofit institution which meets criteria of competence established by the Secretary of Commerce and published in the Federal Register. For the purpose of this subsection the United States Commissioner of Education shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of engineering or business education or training offered. When the Commissioner determines that there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit such programs, he shall publish a list of institutions he finds qualified after prior evaluation by an advisory committee, composed of persons he determines to be specially qualified to evaluate the training provided under such programs.

(d) "Participating institution" means each qualified institution in a State, which participates in the administration or execution of the State technical services program as provided by this Act.

(e) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce or the official to whom the Secretary has delegated all or part of the authority in this Act.

(f) "State" means one of the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

PLANS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 3. The Governor or other competent authority of any State which wishes to receive Federal payments under this Act in support of its existing or planned technical services program shall designate, under appropriate State laws and regulations, an institution or agency to administer and coordinate that program and to prepare and submit plans and programs to the Secretary of Commerce for approval under this Act.

SEC. 4. The designated agency shall prepare and submit to the Secretary in accordance with such regulations as he may publish—

(a) At the beginning of each five-year period, a five-year plan which may be revised

annually and which shall: (1) outline the technological and economic conditions of the State, taking into account its region, business, commerce, and its industrial potential and identify the major regional and industrial problems; (2) identify the general approaches and methods to be used in the solution of these problems and outline the means for measuring the impact of such assistance on the State or regional economy; and (3) explain the methods to be used in administering and coordinating the program.

(b) An annual technical services program which shall (1) identify specific methods, which may include contracts, for accomplishing particular goals and outline the likely impact of these methods in terms of the five-year plan; (2) contain a detailed budget, together with procedures for adequate fiscal control, fund accounting, and auditing, to assure proper disbursement for funds paid to the State under this Act; and (3) indicate the specific responsibilities assigned to each participating institution in the State.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall not accept a five-year plan for review and approval under this Act unless the Governor of the State or his designee determines and certifies that the plan is consistent with State policies and objectives; and the Secretary shall not accept an annual technical services program for review and approval under this Act unless the designated agency has, as certified thereto by the Governor or his designee—

(a) invited all qualified institutions in the State to submit proposals for providing technical services under the Act;

(b) coordinated its programs with other States and with other publicly supported activities within the State, as appropriate;

(c) established adequate rules to insure with no officer or employee of the State, the designated agency or any participating institution, shall receive compensation for technical services for which funds are provided under this Act from sources other than his employer and shall not otherwise maintain any private interest in conflict with his public responsibility;

(d) determined that matching funds will be available from State or other non-Federal sources;

(e) determined that such technical services program does not provide a service that is now available or could be made available as practicably by private technical services, professional consultants, or private institutions;

(f) planned no services specially related to a particular firm or company, public work, or other capital project except insofar as the services are of general concern to the industry and commerce of the community, State, or region;

(g) provided for making public all reports prepared in the course of furnishing technical services supported under this Act or for making them available at cost to any person on request.

APPROVAL BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall review each five-year plan and each annual program submitted by the designated agency under section 4, or by the regional or interstate institution under section 7, and shall approve only those which (1) bear the certification required by the Governor or his designee under section 5; (2) comply with regulations and meet criteria that the Secretary shall promulgate and publish in the Federal Register; and (3) otherwise accomplish the purposes of this Act.

REGIONAL OR INTERSTATE PROGRAMS

SEC. 7. Two or more States may cooperate in administering and coordinating their plans and programs supported under this Act, in which event all or part of the sums authorized and payable under section 11 to all of the cooperating States may be paid to the institutions or persons authorized to

receive them under the terms of the agreement between the cooperating States. When the cooperative agreement designates as regional or interstate institution to act on behalf of all of the cooperating States, it shall submit to the Secretary for review and approval under section 6 a regional or interstate five-year plan and annual regional or interstate technical services program which, as nearly as practicable, shall meet the requirements of section 4 and section 5.

SEC. 8. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 11, the Secretary is authorized to increase by 10 per centum the amount which he approves for any regional or interstate technical services program submitted under section 7. Such additional amount may be paid without requiring matching funds from State or non-Federal sources.

SEC. 9. (a) The consent of the Congress is given to any two or more States to enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law of the United States, for cooperative efforts and mutual assistance in establishing regional or interstate institutions under section 7 for accomplishing the purposes of this Act.

(b) The right to alter, amend, or repeal this section, or any consent granted pursuant to this section, is expressly reserved.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 10. Each designated agency and each regional or interstate institution shall appoint an advisory council for technical services, the members of which shall represent broad community interests and shall be qualified to evaluate programs submitted under section 4. The advisory council shall review each annual program, evaluate its relation to the purposes of this Act, and report its findings to the designated agency and the Governor or his designee. Each report of the advisory council shall be available to the Secretary on request.

ADMINISTRATION AND PAYMENTS

SEC. 11. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this Act, \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; \$30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; \$40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; and \$40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

(a) From these amounts, the Secretary is authorized to make an annual payment to each designated agency, regional or interstate institution, or person authorized to receive payments in support of each approved technical services program. Maximum amounts which may be paid to the States under this subsection shall be fixed in accordance with regulations which the Secretary shall promulgate and publish in the Federal Register from time to time, considering (1) population according to the last decennial census; (2) business, commercial, industrial and economic development and productive efficiency; and (3) technical resources.

(b) The Secretary may reserve an amount equal to not more than 20 per centum of the total amount appropriated each year under this section and is authorized to make payments to any designated agency or participating institution for technical services programs which he determines have special merit or to any qualified institution for additional programs which he determines are necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act, under criteria and regulations that he shall promulgate and publish in the Federal Register.

(c) An amount equal to not more than 5 per centum of the total amount appropriated each year under this section shall be available to the Secretary for the direct expenses of administering this Act.

(d) No amount paid under subsection (a) shall exceed one-half of the cost of the ap-

proved annual technical services program of the State, and for each dollar paid under subsections (a) and (b) there shall be available for expenditure on each approved program at least \$1 from State or other non-Federal sources: *Provided*, That the Secretary may pay an amount not to exceed \$25,000 a year for each of the first three fiscal years to each designated agency to assist in the preparation of the first five-year plan and the initial annual technical services programs, without regard to any requirement of this section.

(e) At the end of each fiscal year, all remaining amounts which are appropriated for payments to the States under subsection (a) and which have not been obligated for payments to the States at that time, shall be available to the Secretary for payments under subsection (b), until expended.

SEC. 12. The Secretary is authorized and directed to aid the States and regions in carrying out their technical services programs by providing reference services which a State or region may use to obtain scientific, technical, and engineering information from sources outside the State or region, for the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 13. The Secretary is authorized to establish such policies, standards, criteria, and procedures and to prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or appropriate for the administration of this Act.

LIMITATIONS

SEC. 14. (a) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as authorizing a department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or conditions with respect to the personnel, curriculum, methods of instructions, or administration of any educational institution.

(b) Nothing contained in this Act shall be deemed to affect the functions or responsibilities under law of any other department or agency of the United States.

EVALUATION

SEC. 15. Within five years from the date of the approval of this Act, and prior to the end of each five-year period thereafter, the Secretary shall appoint a public committee, none of the members of which shall have been directly concerned with the preparation of plans, administration of programs or participation in programs under this Act. The Committee shall evaluate the significance and impact of the program under this Act and make recommendations concerning the program. A report shall be transmitted to the Secretary within sixty days after the end of each five-year period.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 16. (a) Each designated agency or regional or interstate institution shall make an annual report to the Secretary on or before the first day of September of each year on the work accomplished under the technical services program and the status of current services, together with a detailed statement of the amounts received under any of the provisions of this Act during the preceding fiscal year, and of their disbursement.

(b) The Secretary shall make a complete report with respect to the administration of this Act to the President and the Congress not later than January 31 following the end of each fiscal year for which amounts are appropriated pursuant to this Act.

TERMINATION

SEC. 17. Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to any agency or institution receiving funds under this Act finds that—

(a) the agency or institution is not complying substantially with the provisions of this Act, with the regulations promulgated

by the Secretary or with the approved annual technical services program; or

(b) any funds paid to the agency or institution under the provisions of this Act have been lost, misapplied, or otherwise diverted from the purposes for which they were paid or furnished—

the Secretary shall notify such agency or institution that no further payments will be made under the provisions of this Act until he is satisfied that there is substantial compliance or the diversion has been corrected or, if compliance or correction is impossible, until such agency or institution repays or arranges for the repayment of Federal funds which have been diverted or improperly expended.

SEC. 18. Upon notice by the Secretary to any agency or institution that no further payments will be made pending substantial compliance correction or repayment under section 17, any funds which may have been paid to such agency or institution under this Act and which are not expended by the agency or institution on the date of such notice, shall be repaid to the Secretary and be deposited to the account of the appropriations from which they originally were paid.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 19. This Act may be cited as the "State Technical Services Act of 1965".

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to promote commerce and encourage economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise."

Mr. MAGNUSON. On February 2 I had the privilege of introducing S. 949, the proposed State Technical Services Act of 1965, at the request of the Secretary of Commerce. Its purpose is to authorize Federal grants to States in a cooperative program to spread the findings of science and technology throughout American business, commerce, and industry. Its objective is to use all of our scientific and technical knowledge to enhance the economy of the Nation as a whole.

This bill and S. 2083, a similar measure introduced by Senator SCOTT, were considered at length in hearings before the Committee on Commerce to which they were referred. The Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] graciously chaired the hearings and developed a record of unqualified support for this very vital program for using science for economic growth.

The Commerce Committee has unanimously reported S. 949 to the floor with amendments and, together with Senators RIBICOFF, BYRD of West Virginia, McGOVERN, and DOUGLAS, 16 members of the Commerce Committee have added their names as cosponsors of the bill as reported.

So I take great satisfaction and pride in supporting this bill which uniquely treats the results of science as a national resource, to be diffused more efficiently by State and regional action. We all know of the imbalances that exist today in scientific activity throughout the United States—among industries and among firms within industries. We must remember that of the \$15 billion or so of annual Federal research and development product, a relatively small portion finds its way to stimulate the civilian sector of the economy.

I do not mean to suggest that scientific advances paid for by peace, defense, and atomic research cannot be converted to civilian industrial uses. What I do suggest is that no national effort has been marshaled to take the results of this federally financed research and development, as well as other significant scientific findings, and put them to use effectively by those who comprehend local needs: by the local businesses, by the industries of States and regions, by local chambers of commerce, by labor, by the universities, and by responsible State and local officials.

The bill before us today is the first measure of its kind aimed at putting the responsibility for using the results of science and technology directly upon those who will most directly benefit from it. While the Federal Government will give grants under prescribed conditions, the entire planning and program activities will be carried out by the States through the responsible State agencies and institutions of the State.

It will work along the following lines. The Governor of each State will designate an agency to draw up plans and administer the program for the State. The designated agency will draw up long-term economic and technical plans for the State to identify the State's potential for using science and technology to enhance the industry and commerce of the State. Yearly technical services programs will be prepared with the assistance of all qualified institutions in the State—which are mainly universities, but may also be competent nonprofit organizations. The plans and programs are submitted to the Secretary of Commerce under criteria set forth in the bill. The Secretary, upon approval, may grant up to one-half of the amount of the yearly program. The remainder can come from State or other non-Federal sources. Each State will be authorized under regulations set by the Secretary of Commerce to receive up to a maximum amount each year. The Secretary of Commerce has stated that the largest amount authorized for a single State would be no more than \$2 million and the smallest amount allocated to a State would be no less than \$150,000.

The Department of Commerce will make annual reports to the Congress. There will be a 5-year review by a public committee.

The committee amendment limits the authorization for appropriations to a 5-year period. The total amount authorized for the 5-year period will be \$140 million, beginning with \$10 million for fiscal year 1966 and increasing to \$40 million by 1969 and 1970. After fiscal year 1970, further authorization will be required by the Congress.

I think this legislation is farsighted, creative and will be recognized by future generations as a dynamic model of what President Johnson has called creative federalism. It places responsibility where the exercise of responsibility will produce the surest return for the Nation as a whole. It will diffuse the vast reservoir of technology that is accumulating in this country throughout the whole of the country.

Mr. President, I am proud that this bill has strong bipartisan support by members of my committee. Such support demonstrates that our free institutions and Government can take far-reaching and sophisticated steps toward applying science and technology to our economic problems for the betterment of mankind without impairing individual creativity and initiative. This bill now before you is long overdue. I am confident that it will be enacted promptly so that its benefits may begin throughout the country without delay.

I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the committee report which explains the purpose, need, and description of the technical services program be printed at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 949

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

S. 949 would authorize a 5-year program of matching grants to the States in a cooperative effort to promote the wider diffusion and more effective application of the findings of science and technology throughout American commerce and industry. The technical services program would draw upon the resources of universities, nonprofit research organizations and State and local agencies, in locally planned and administered technical services designed to place these findings usefully in the hands of local businesses and enterprises.

NEED FOR THE TECHNICAL SERVICES PROGRAM

A close examination of the modern American economy reveals a number of recurring themes—all of them related in some degree to the importance of having effective mechanisms for introducing the results of science and technology into commercial use; for example, the competition we face in both domestic and world markets is increasingly based on a high level of technology, not solely on lower labor costs.

The most successful competitors, whether at an international level, industrywide, or among individual companies, are those who have learned to use new technology effectively.

The cost of new technology, in the form of technical manpower and equipment, has been rapidly rising.

Opportunities to participate in benefits of technology have not been equally available in the various regions of the United States.

Substantial expenditures for specialized research and development in support of national defense and space missions have not met the full range of industrial needs for technology.

The vast increase in the Nation's total research and development effort has not eradicated long-term unemployment and economic decline in many parts of the country.

Technology cannot be effectively diffused merely by giving information to a potential user. There must be means for active interchange between those using and those furnishing information.

There are many factors involved in complete solutions to the broad problems outlined above. Common to all of them, however, is the need for institutions and mechanisms at the local level, specifically designed to bridge the gap between the most advanced technology, wherever it exists, and the industrial practices of the local region.

Through the technical services program and with the cooperation of universities, communities, and industries, three objectives will be served: (1) strengthening the Nation's economy by upgrading industries

through the utilization of advanced technology, thereby generally expanding the industrial base; (2) increasing employment by facilitating industrial use of technology and the manufacturing of new products which result; and (3) enhancing the competitive position of U.S. products in world markets.

DESCRIPTION OF THE TECHNICAL SERVICES PROGRAM

A State wishing to participate in the program would designate an agency (generally a State university or land-grant college) to administer and coordinate the State's technical services program.

The designated agency would prepare a 5-year plan, outlining the technological and economic situation in the State, the major regional and industrial problems, and the means to be used in assisting in their solution.

The designated agency would also prepare an annual technical services program, covering the objectives for the first year, the budget, and the responsibilities assigned to each qualified institution participating in the program. Up to \$25,000 per year for each of the first 3 years may be paid to the designated agency to assist in preparing the first 5-year plan and the initial annual programs.

An advisory council would be established by the designated agency to evaluate and report on the 5-year plan and the annual technical service program.

The 5-year plan and the annual program would be submitted to the Secretary of Commerce. Federal matching funds would be made available to the designated agency to support those programs found by the Secretary to meet legal requirements and to further the purposes of the act. The maximum annual payment in support of any State program will be limited by a formula to be established by the Secretary, taking into consideration these criteria: (1) Population according to the last census, (2) industrial and economic development.

All funds made available to States for technical services, except regional incentives, would be matched at least equally by non-Federal funds. Direct Federal expenditures would be limited to expenditures for administration, to be held to less than 5 percent of the cost of the program, and for reference services to aid the States and regions in collecting and processing technical information for dissemination to industry under the act.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the able Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and I have long worked on this subject. We are very pleased now to be privileged to bring it before the Senate, and to urge its passage.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Senate Commerce Committee today voted unanimously to report the proposed State Technical Services Act of 1965, S. 949, to the Senate, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman, announced today.

The bill, as reported, combines the provisions of S. 949, introduced by Senator MAGNUSON, and S. 2083, introduced by Senator SCOTT. It would authorize \$140 million of matching Federal grants to the States over a 5-year period in a cooperative program to spread the findings of science and technology throughout American business and industry.

The technical services program was strongly supported during the 3 days of committee hearings by a wide range of

public and private witnesses, including representatives of State governments, State universities, land-grant colleges, professional engineers, and profit and nonprofit research organizations.

As the committee completed final action on the bill, several committee members added their names as sponsors to the bill. In addition to Senators MAGNUSON and SCOTT, these include Senators PASTORE, LAUSCHE, BARTLETT, MCGEE, HART, CANNON, and DOMINICK.

Mr. President, I appreciate this opportunity to express my support of legislation to enable the Federal Government to join the States in close partnership with universities and other educational institutions to establish technical services programs designed to put into the hands of local business and industry the latest and most useful findings of science and technology. The purpose of this program is to promote industrial modernization and economic growth and thereby to improve the competitive position of American business and industry in world markets. It can result in the development of new products, an indispensable ingredient for spurring the expansion of a company's sales. It can develop new technologies to aid in the revival of declining industries.

The program to be established by this legislation would be a great help to the industrial complex of Pennsylvania. Surveys could be made to determine what the needs are for particular types or groups of industries. Then, the participating educational institutions in my Commonwealth could set up appropriate technical services programs, either through specialists or by the normal educational processes for those persons in industries who could benefit from this work.

Under the enlightened leadership of Governor Scranton, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, through such organizations as the Governor's Council of Business and Industry, the Committee of 100,000 and the Governor's Council on Science and Technology, has developed a mutually beneficial liaison between Government, industry, and the academy to spur Pennsylvania's industrial expansion and economic growth. A technical services program can improve this growing relationship.

I think that this legislation can make a real contribution to the industrial and economic growth of Pennsylvania and other States and regions of this Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read a third time, and passed.

COLLEGE STUDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965—INTRODUCTION OF BILL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today I am offering for myself and Senators McCARTHY and WILLIAMS of New Jersey, a bill entitled the College Students' Assistance Act of 1965. It is a very simple bill whose effect would be to undergird

students faced with the costs of attending college by providing for them, following completion of academic work in good standing, \$100 at the end of each semester, or a pro rata portion if the school is on some other calendar system.

Mr. President, while the returns from investments in higher education are most attractive economically, the cost of the investment to the average American family is prohibitive at worst and a tremendous burden at best. The result is a great loss of potential college-qualified youth to the overcrowded job market at lower levels.

In testimony last year before the Education Subcommittee, Commissioner Francis Keppel of the Office of Education noted the annual cost of attending college in public institutions—less expensive than private colleges—has risen from a low of \$730 in 1930 to \$1,480 today and a projected \$2,400 in 1980. The 1962-63 average direct cost in private institutions already reaches \$2,240. In comparing these average cost figures with the annual median family income of \$5,700, Dr. Keppel points out that college education is an "extremely large outlay for most American families," second only to the purchase of a home. For a family of three children such an expenditure may amount to \$18,000 in public institutions over a period of 8 years, while in private institutions the figure would climb to \$27,000.

Such heavy expenditures are doubtless responsible for many of the 100,000 to 200,000 high-aptitude students who do not finish their education. Considerable numbers of interested and able students find college beyond their means, and thus, never begin higher education work. The result is a restricted range of job opportunities for them and a serious failure to maximize our greatest natural resource—an educated populace.

What particularly concerns me, Mr. President, is not alone the lost potential to these individuals and our Nation, but also the severe financial strain on families which do manage to send their children to college. Years of sacrifice are often required by the entire family. The student, if not the family, is often saddled with educational debts once he has completed his training.

In recent years we have become cognizant of these problems and heedful of some of these needs. However, efforts have been considerably limited. Effort has primarily been directed to the excellent student while we have failed to scrutinize the potential and needs of the average college student.

Last year I introduced S. 2490, a multiphase package program designed to aid larger numbers of our youth. The bill was favorably reported out by the committee with amendments as S. 3140 and remained on the calendar at the time of adjournment. With some alteration I again introduced this bill as S. 5 last January and its basic provisions are also contained in the administration's omnibus bill, S. 600.

In 1960 the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics brought to our attention some startling estimates for this decade concerning the changing

job mix. Within the labor force the biggest percentage increases are expected in the skilled labor group. Clerical and proprietary groups likewise are to witness remarkable increases of 24 percent. The most revealing figure, however, is the estimated 41 percent increase in the professional and technical occupations, a growth rate more than double that of the labor force as a whole. The report is only one example to show that job opportunities and job requirements are clearly tied to educational experience beyond the secondary level.

In economic terms, investment in higher education provides significant returns for both the individual and for the national economy. We now recognize the vast potential of an educated populace as a natural resource. The requirements of defense and the exigencies of the space race have most poignantly brought this to our attention; and we are beginning to shift from the past popular view of education as a cost and a burden to a realistic understanding of education as an investment providing returns of significant proportions. Dr. T. W. Schultz, of the University of Chicago, for example, has calculated that for each dollar spent in all education there is a return of 17 cents each year—that is, a 17-percent return. Prof. Arthur Mauch, of the University of Michigan, discussed the same proposition in aggregate terms in the February 1964 issue of the *Journal of the American Bankers' Association*. He said in part:

Our gross national product is in the neighborhood of \$600 billion a year. If we credited the effects of education to only 10 percent of this, instead of the 20 percent or more that studies indicate would be justified, it would not seem out of line to invest up to \$60 billion. Only about \$25 billion, or less than 5 percent, is being spent by educational institutions from kindergarten through university, both public and private.

In light of these figures the United States is seriously lagging in investment in an area of high return.

Investment in higher education has significant meaning likewise for the individual. Figures for 1961 incomes show that the college graduate's income average more than 50 percent above that of the high school graduate. It is not surprising, moreover, that the 20 percent who attended college hold more than 70 percent of the jobs that pay above \$5,000 per year.

The bill I introduce today is presented by myself and Senator McCARTHY not as a substitute but as a complement to S. 5. Mr. President, we feel that we should now make an annual stipend to all interested students who maintain a full-time load at a satisfactory level in an accredited institution. Consequently, this bill calls for the Commissioner of Education to convey \$200 annually to such students for the purpose of defraying educational expenses. This stipend will be a much needed stimulus to students who otherwise find college costs prohibitive and a much needed relief for families strained by these expenses. This stipend is intended to help keep higher education within the financial range of the average American family. To be sure, there will yet be many who will require additional

help, and it is precisely here that such programs as S. 5 become pertinent.

Mr. President, in order that others may consider the bill and join in its sponsorship, I ask that the complete text may appear in the RECORD at the close of my remarks, and that the bill lie on the table until the close of business July 28.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 2303) to authorize payments to college students for satisfactory undergraduate work, introduced by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. McCARTHY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2303

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "College Students' Assistance Act of 1965".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) the term "State" means a State, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands;

(b) the term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or other non-profit institution, and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited, and for the purposes of this clause, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered; and

(c) the term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

PAYMENTS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 3. The Commissioner shall make payments to citizens and permanent residents of the United States for maintaining satisfactory standing in carrying a normal full-time academic undergraduate workload in an institution of higher education. Such payments shall be made—

(1) upon application therefor at such times and including such proof as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, including a certification of satisfactory standing and the carrying of a normal workload by the institution attended, determined by such institution in accordance with standards established by the Commissioner;

(2) at the termination of each semester or other division of the academic year if semesters are not used;

(3) at the rate of \$200 per academic year or its equivalent as defined by the Commissioner; and

(4) for semesters or such other divisions of the academic year beginning after June 30, 1965.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

STATEMENT OF UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY ON FIREARMS CONTROL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of Senator Dobb's firearms control bill, S. 1592, I have followed with interest the hearings and the arguments surrounding the question.

In addition to the consideration being given in the Senate, the House Ways and Means Committee has been holding hearings on the question as posed by H.R. 6628 and H.R. 6783. Among those who have given testimony there is the Honorable Joseph W. Barr, Under Secretary of the Treasury.

I ask unanimous consent that the testimony of Mr. Barr may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH W. BARR, UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON PROPOSALS RELATING TO FIREARMS CONTROL, JULY 12, 1965

Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity to appear in support of the enactment of the administration's bills introduced by Mr. MURPHY and Mr. MULDER, which I deem to be of great importance to the welfare of this country and its citizens. Mr. Sheldon S. Cohen, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is here with me. He will discuss in more detail aspects of the administration's proposals which I will cover in a general way.

The bill which would amend the Federal Firearms Act regulating interstate and foreign commerce in firearms is designed to implement the recommendations which the President set forth with respect to firearms control in his message to the Congress of March 8, 1965, relating to law enforcement and the administration of justice.

The President, in that message, described crime as "a malignant enemy in America's midst" of such extent and seriousness that the problem is now one "of great national concern." The President also stated, and I quote from his message, "The time has come now, to check that growth, to contain its spread, and to reduce its toll of lives and property."

As an integral part of the war against the spread of lawlessness, the President urged the enactment of more effective firearms control legislation, and cited as a significant factor in the rise of violent crime in the United States "the ease with which any person can acquire firearms."

The President recognized the necessity for State and local action, as well as Federal action, in this area and he urged "the Governors of our States and mayors and other local public officials to review their existing legislation in this critical field with a view to keeping lethal weapons out of the wrong hands." However, the President also clearly recognized in his message that effective State and local regulation of firearms is not feasible unless we strengthen at the Federal level controls over the importation of firearms

and over the interstate shipment of firearms. The President advised that he was proposing draft legislation to accomplish these aims, and stated, and I quote, "I recommend this legislation to the Congress as a sensible use of Federal authority to assist local authorities in coping with an undeniable menace to law and order and to the lives of innocent people." H.R. 6628, introduced by Mr. MURPHY, and H.R. 6783, introduced by Mr. MULDER, reflect the legislation amending the Federal Firearms Act, to which the President referred.

I should like now briefly to state my understanding of what the administration bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act would do and, in order to eliminate misconceptions, what it would not do.

Among other things, the bill would:

(1) Prohibit the shipment of firearms in interstate commerce, except between federally licensed manufacturers, dealers, and importers; the purpose of this is to control the distribution of firearms interstate so that States may more effectively control the traffic intrastate.

(2) Prohibit sales of firearms by Federal licensees to persons under 21 years of age, except that sales of sporting rifles and shotguns could continue to be made to persons of 18 years of age;

(3) Prohibit a Federal licensee from selling a firearm (other than a rifle or shotgun) to any person who is not a resident of the State where the licensee is doing business;

(4) Curb the flow into the United States of surplus military weapons and other firearms not suitable for sporting purposes;

(5) Bring under effective Federal control the importation and interstate shipment of large caliber weapons such as bazookas and antitank guns, and other destructive devices; and

(6) Revise the licensing provisions of the Federal Firearms Act, including increases in license fees, so as to assure that licenses will be issued only to responsible persons actually engaging in business as importers, manufacturers, and dealers.

What the bill does is to institute Federal controls in areas where the Federal Government can and should operate, and where the State governments cannot, the areas of interstate and foreign commerce. Under our Federal constitutional system, the responsibility for maintaining public health and safety is left to the State governments under their police powers. Basically, it is the province of the State governments to determine the conditions under which their citizens may acquire and use firearms. I certainly hope that in those States where there is not now adequate regulation of the acquisition of firearms, steps will soon be taken to institute controls complementing the steps taken in this bill in order to deal effectively with this serious menace.

I am particularly anxious that the changes proposed in the bill with respect to the issuance of licenses to manufacture, import and deal in firearms be adopted. Under existing law, anyone other than a felon can, upon the mere allegation that he is a dealer and payment of a fee of \$1, demand and obtain a license. Some 50 or 60 thousand people have done this, some of them merely to put themselves in a position to obtain personal guns at wholesale. The situation is wide open for the obtaining of licenses by irresponsible elements, thus facilitating the acquisition of these weapons by criminals and other undesirables. The bill before you, by increasing license fees and imposing standards for obtaining licenses, will go a long way toward rectifying this situation. Mr. Cohen, whose organization is responsible for the administration of the Federal Firearms Act will discuss this aspect in more detail.

One misconception about the administration's bill to amend the Federal Firearms

Act which has been widely publicized is that it will make it possible for the Treasury Department to exercise, through the regulatory authority expressed in the bill, such arbitrary power as to be virtually dictatorial, and so potentially restrictive as to permit the elimination of private ownership of guns at the whim of the Secretary. This misunderstanding has been fostered by certain national gun, and wildlife conservation, organizations whose representatives, in testifying at Senate hearings on a companion bill, have pointed with alarm to seven places in the bill where regulatory authority is granted to the Secretary of the Treasury.

You and I know that it is customary for the Congress to vest discretionary powers in a Government officer to implement legislation through the issuance of regulations. Such regulations are necessary to provide flexibility and to take care of problems which may be unforeseen by the lawmakers. This flexibility, within the guidelines of standards and policies laid down by the Congress, inures to the benefit of the citizen affected as well as to Government. Moreover, a grant of regulatory authority is not, and cannot in any sense be, a dictatorial fiat. Surely no rational, intelligent individual can seriously maintain that the Secretary of the Treasury would issue regulations under this proposed legislation so arbitrary or capricious or so complicated or impracticable or so burdensome that they would make impossible the private ownership of guns. There is nothing in the bill that would authorize this and if any attempt were made to do so there is abundant opportunity for appeal to the courts, the top administrative machinery, or to the Congress.

Any allegation of this nature, which attempts to obscure the merits of the bill by raising imaginary fears of possible maladministration, ignores completely the Treasury Department's past administrative record as well as the statutory and Constitutional limitations on executive authority. The Secretary of the Treasury has for 27 years exercised regulatory authority under the Federal Firearms Act in many of the seven areas pointed to by critics of the bill where details or procedures are to be prescribed by regulations. In fact, section 907 of the present law provides "the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this chapter." The term, "this chapter," incidentally, includes the entire Federal Firearms Act. During these years there has been no regulatory abuse which can be cited. I do not believe that there is a single provision of existing regulations (26 CFR Pt. 177) which can be said to be unreasonable or beyond the intent of Congress and in the 27-year history of this act no regulation issued under it has been held invalid by the courts.

Irresponsible allegations to the contrary, the bill does not, and regulations under it can not, seriously interfere with the acquisition, ownership or use of firearms for sporting purposes, or any other legitimate use. Sportsmen will continue to be able to obtain rifles and shotguns from licensed dealers and manufacturers subject only to the requirements of their respective State laws. Indeed, they can travel to another State and purchase a rifle or shotgun from a licensed dealer there and bring it home with them without interference. Only two minor inconveniences may occur for the sportsmen of this country. They will not be able to travel to another State and purchase a pistol or concealable weapon, and they will not be able to obtain a mail-order shipment from another State of any type of firearm. On this latter point, the inconvenience is more apparent than real because the large mail-order houses have retail outlets and the bill will permit intrastate mail-order shipments to individual citizens from these outlets.

Such minor inconveniences cannot be avoided if the legislation is to make it possible for the States to regulate effectively the acquisition and possession of firearms. Obviously, State authorities cannot control the acquisition and possession of firearms if they have no way of knowing or ascertaining what firearms are coming in to their States through the mails or, in the case of concealable weapons, by personally being carried across State lines.

Mr. Chairman, there are many other points which could be made with respect to the administration's bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act. For example, I think it is self-evident that minors should not have access to pistols, other concealable firearms and weapons of vast destructive power, and that minors under the age of 18 should not have access to rifles or shotguns.

Today, the people of the United States are living under the most ideal conditions which have ever existed for any peoples anywhere on earth. Yet much of this is threatened by the spreading cancer of crime and juvenile delinquency. It is absolutely essential that steps such as those proposed in this bill be taken to bring under control one of the main elements in the spread of this cancer, the indiscriminate acquisition of weapons of destruction.

The ease with which any person can acquire firearms (including criminals, juveniles without the knowledge or consent of their parents or guardians, narcotic addicts, mental defectives, armed groups who would supplant duly constituted public authorities, and others whose possession of firearms is similarly contrary to the public interest) is a matter of serious national concern.

The existing Federal controls over interstate and foreign commerce are not sufficient to enable the States to effectively cope with the firearms traffic within their own borders through the exercise of their police power. Only through adequate Federal control over interstate and foreign commerce in firearms, and over all persons engaging in the business of importing, manufacturing, or dealing in firearms, can this problem be dealt with, and effective State and local regulation of the firearms traffic be made possible.

The Department's experience with the existing Federal Firearms Act has resulted in a feeling of frustration since the controls provided by it are so obviously inadequate. In drafting the administration's bill we have had in mind these inadequacies and now have, we believe, a bill which, when enacted, will provide effective controls without jeopardizing or interfering with the freedom of law-abiding citizens to own firearms for legitimate purposes.

As to the administration's bill which would amend the National Firearms Act, H.R. 6629 introduced by Mr. MURPHY and H.R. 6782 introduced by Mr. MULDER, there seems to be a general recognition of its need and no serious opposition to its objectives.

The National Firearms Act now provides for Federal controls, under the taxing power, with respect to gangster-type weapons such as machineguns and sawed-off shotguns. It has long been felt that similar controls are needed for highly destructive weapons such as grenades, rockets, missiles, and large-bore military-type ordnance in the nature of anti-tank guns, mortars, and grenade launchers. Although it is difficult to conceive of any valid reason for their private ownership, such devices are frequently available for purchase at stores specializing in military surplus and there is presently no Federal law effectively regulating their sale or ownership. They have found their way into the hands of lawless and irresponsible elements such as armed groups who would supplant duly constituted public authorities and those who recently fired on the United Nations building. The administration's bill to amend the National Firearms Act is designed to regu-

late, by taxing, the dealing in and transfer of these highly destructive devices.

There appears to be no doubt that Federal controls are needed in this area. The Secretary of the Army stressed the need for effective controls over these weapons in expressing, to the Director of the Budget, the position of the Department of Defense on proposed firearms legislation. The National Rifle Association in an April 3, 1965, release declared that "it would support properly drawn legislation to outlaw dangerous devices such as bazookas, bombs, antitank guns and other military-type weapons which have found their way into trade channels across America." A trade association of firearms manufacturers, Small Arms Manufacturers Institute, has also indicated approval of such controls, in testimony by its representative, Dr. Hadley, before the Senate Subcommittee Hearings on S. 1591 (the companion bill to H.R. 6629 and 6782). The only opposition to controls over these destructive devices seems to stem from that irresponsible faction which opposes, on principle, controls of any nature with respect to firearms or self-appointed "defenders of America" who have formed para-military organizations.

The bill would also increase to twice the present rate all of the rates of tax in the National Firearms Act. The principal rates have not been changed since the original enactment of the act in 1934. Therefore, it is necessary to increase the rates in order to carry out the regulatory purposes of the act.

It is recognized that some perfecting changes within the intent and purpose of the bill to amend the national act may be desirable. Commissioner Cohen, whose testimony follows mine, will discuss specific proposals to effect changes in both this bill and the administration's bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act.

Enactment of the administration's bills to amend the Federal Firearms Act and the National Firearms Act is needed now to augment existing controls to keep firearms out of the wrong hands. These bills are an essential and integral part of the President's program to combat crime. Therefore, I strongly urge that this committee report these bills to the House of Representatives at an early date.

LAOTIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a few weeks ago we celebrated July 4th with the pride and enthusiasm that has characterized our traditional appreciation for national independence and liberty.

Today, Mr. President, the Kingdom of Laos is celebrating her day of independence. During the postwar period her struggle for liberty was rewarded with total independence, and now she speaks for herself in the United Nations.

Lodged at the periphery of the Communist bloc where national independence and security are always precarious, this constitutional monarchy must continually face external pressures that would rend her asunder and deprive her of the fruits of liberty. But her resistance and resiliency to these pressures is determined.

Internally her Government seeks to bind together her peoples in meeting the challenges of economic and political development. The task is trying and the future is not sure, but we trust that this nation which has known the agonies of foreign domination will vigorously pursue the course of national amalgamation

and independence. We can appreciate her challenges and her spirit; for, while our forefathers were not so plagued by foreign intrigue, they nevertheless had to forge a nation.

Her efforts for liberty and independence may be assured of American support. We joined the Geneva agreements in 1962 for a neutral and independent Laos; and we stand by those agreements today.

I join well-wishers throughout the world in saluting the Kingdom of Laos on her day of national independence.

EXEMPTION OF OCEANOGRAPHIC VESSELS FROM APPLICATION OF CERTAIN VESSEL INSPECTION LAWS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 627) to exempt oceanographic research vessels from the application of certain vessel inspection laws, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, line 6, after "is" strike out "operated in the public interest by being employed exclusively in scientific research, or instruction in oceanography or limnology, or both; and", and insert "being employed exclusively in instruction in oceanography or limnology, or both, or exclusively in oceanographic research, including, but not limited to, such studies pertaining to the sea as seismic, gravity meter and magnetic exploration, and other marine geophysical or geological surveys, atmosphere research, and biological research."

On page 2, after line 1, insert:

SEC. 3. An oceanographic research vessel shall not be deemed to be engaged in trade or commerce.

On page 2, line 8, strike out "Sec. 3." and insert "Sec. 4."; on page 2, line 12, strike out "Sec. 4." and insert "Sec. 5."; and on page 2, line 17, strike out "the public interest," and insert "the performance of the mission of the vessel."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

ELECTED MAYOR, CITY COUNCIL, AND NONVOTING DELEGATE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 368, Senate bill 1118.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1118) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment.

THE DEVELOPING MONOPOLY OF AIRLINE SERVICE BETWEEN BOSTON, NEW YORK, AND WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of the Congress a matter which has been of particular concern to me for some time, and one which I feel deserves immediate investigation. I refer to the development over the past few years of virtual monopoly control by one airline—Eastern—over the major air commuter routes between Boston and New York, and between New York and Washington, and the pattern of substantially increased commuter fares without any significant improvement in equipment and quality of service. This pattern of monopoly has apparently developed despite the fact that there are at least three other certificated carriers on these routes to provide competitive service.

My special interest here is with the airline passenger—the commuter, the businessman, the visitor, the student—who must be assured of the benefits of competition in receiving the lowest possible fares and the highest and most modern quality of service. It is for the public interest that I raise these warnings today—that the developing airline monopoly on these routes is something of direct and far-reaching consumer interest.

The two major airline commuter markets referred to above are the second and third largest—by passenger volume—in the world. They are of the highest passenger density. They involve an annual traffic load of over 3.3 million passengers, providing more than \$55 million in annual revenue. Indeed, it is in these very markets where competition should be keenest, and prices and quality of service should be in the best interests of the public.

When we compare the above east coast situation with the world's largest air passenger market—San Francisco-Los Angeles—the issue becomes even more striking. There, the market has been one of intensive competition, with no single carrier reaching more than 45 percent of the traffic in 1964, and with some four carriers actively competing. The pattern for this route has been one of consistently decreasing commuter fares, and constant upgrading of equipment and quality of service with modern jet prop and jet aircraft being used exclusively.

Mr. President, I would like to state for the RECORD some of the facts which have been submitted to me by the Civil Aeronautics Board and others at my request, so that we can get a more detailed picture of the serious situation which has developed—see attachments I, II, and V.

For the year 1964—the latest official figures submitted—between Boston and

New York, Eastern Airlines carried almost 76 percent of local and connecting passengers; Northeast Airlines carried 17 percent; American Airlines carried only 2 percent; and the other carriers certificated together accounted for some 5 percent. Total passengers carried over the route were 1,814,550.

For the same year between New York and Washington, Eastern's market share reached almost 80 percent; American had slightly less than 9 percent of the traffic; National Airlines accounted for 6 percent; and the remaining carriers aggregated 5 percent. For this route total passengers reached 1,495,370.

It is interesting to note that in 1960, Eastern and American each controlled about a third of these two major markets, and Northeast averaged around 20 percent. In 1961, in the very month when Northeast filed for renewal of its Florida route, Eastern inaugurated its special shuttle service at reduced rates and guaranteed seats.

The original fare between New York and Boston was \$10.91, without tax. Between New York and Washington, it was \$12.73.

Within 8 months, Eastern had increased its passenger traffic in each of these markets by some 35 percent, and shuttle fares were jumped to \$11.82 and \$13.64, respectively.

By the end of 1962, Eastern's share in each of the above markets exceeded 54 percent, and it raised its fares again, this time to \$12.38 for the Boston-New York run, and to \$14.29 for the New York-Washington route. By this time, Northeast had suffered a decrease of 50 percent of its traffic on this latter route.

By the end of 1963, Eastern Airlines had increased its share of these markets to approximately 77 percent, and thereafter on January 8, 1964, it raised its fares once again, to \$13.33 and \$15.24, respectively. American's traffic decreased between New York and Washington by some 37 percent for this year. However, more significant is American's 66 percent decrease in traffic between New York and Boston.

After sustaining this very large market share during 1964, Eastern once more increased its shuttle prices to \$15.24 for the Boston-New York market, and \$17.14 for the New York-Washington route. This is its current fare level.

Thus in the 52 months since the inauguration of the shuttle, Eastern has increased its share of the subject markets from 33 percent to almost 80 percent, and during this period it has jumped its fares four times, by more than 40 percent. At the same time, this carrier has continued to use superannuated piston aircraft DC-7's and Constellations on its commuter routes, much of which equipment is at least 10 years in age, uncomfortable and crowded in its seating, unattractive in its interior, is noisy and is given to substantial vibration. This equipment appears to be largely castoff aircraft from Eastern's other routes which have now received the newer jet prop and jet equipment.

I might say that with respect to the equipment situation, Eastern has recently announced that it expects to put

jet prop Electras on its commuter routes by October. This, indeed, is welcome news, but it comes rather late in the game, especially when we observe that the San Francisco-Los Angeles market has had both jet prop and pure jet equipment for some time. Furthermore, I am told that Eastern has been considering a seating configuration of six seats abreast, thus again providing a crowded airplane; in contrast to the equipment provided on the west coast commuter run.

Now let us compare the west coast commuter route. There we find new equipment, as I have mentioned, and fares nearly one-half those of the two major eastern commuter markets for comparable mileage. On the western route, the yield per seat mile averages about 3.4 cents, while for Eastern Airlines, between Boston and New York, it is 8.3 cents, and between New York and Washington, it is 8 cents. I cite these figures not with the intention of drawing any definite conclusions, but with the belief that they present substantial justification for investigation into the reasonableness of price and service in the eastern commuter markets—see attachments III and IV.

Let us look at the rate comparisons with the western route. Between Los Angeles and San Francisco, a distance of 125 miles longer than the route from New York to Washington, the commuter fare is \$11.43 for jet-prop Electras, and \$13.50 for modern jet aircraft. This is to be contrasted with the New York-Washington shuttle fare of \$17.14 for piston-engine Constellations.

For the 109-mile run from Los Angeles to San Diego, the fare is \$6.35 for prop jet service, while on the 184-mile run between Boston and New York, the current shuttle fare is \$15.24 for piston engine aircraft.

Mr. President, in the light of the facts and issues presented, I should like to raise some questions. I make no pretense to knowing the answers to these questions; however, I feel that they can be helpful in analyzing this problem in the best interests of the airline passenger.

Thus, what is the true relationship between the Eastern shuttle and rapidly decreasing market positions of Northeast and American? Was this new service a loss leader calculated to eliminate or at least discourage competitors? If the shuttle was not a losing proposition, then why were the continuing fare hikes allowed? Has the overwhelming market dominance of Eastern given it the opportunity to charge what the market will bear, with no need to be concerned about the quality of equipment and service?

How seriously has the Board analyzed the competitive impact of Eastern's policy of service saturation upon the other competitive carriers? I am informed that the Board has declined to make any full investigation of this matter, and that there have been no hearings on it, despite a formal request by Northeast that it do so.

How deeply has the Board gone into each of these price rises in determining their cost justification? An opportunity

for investigation and hearings was presented in connection with recent fare increases, but the Board rejected the opportunity. What was the policy behind this? Are we to be plagued by further price increases, and a continuing lack of competition?

Finally, even assuming that the concept of the shuttle is a good one, and that Eastern's growth was "thrusted upon" it, what has the Board done to encourage Eastern's rival to compete with the shuttle? To what extent has the Board inquired into the reasons why American Airlines—the second largest trunkline carrier in the Nation—has declined to compete with Eastern? What can be done to stimulate competition on these Eastern routes, comparable to that on the west coast?

By this statement, I do not wish in any way to disparage the basic idea of a low-price, commuter-type service. We have seen this service working well in the San Francisco-Los Angeles market with attractive fares and good equipment. We have seen it operating there among competitive carriers. The idea of having a commuter plane available at appointed times without reservation during a substantial portion of the day is an excellent one. What bothers me is that when one carrier comes in with a service which saturates the market and discourages competitors, so that it can raise its fares and continue to provide unimproved quality of service without the check of competition, something is wrong. I am worried that Eastern's monopoly may already have jeopardized the public interest.

The Civil Aeronautics Board had the opportunity to fully investigate the monopoly and increased fare problem posed by Eastern's operation when docket 15713 was before it last November, but it declined to do so. This was the document that was referred to earlier, in which the fares of Northeast, Eastern, and Braniff were considered—see attachment IV.

Squarely before the Board was the question of whether—at the close of a record-breaking year for all airlines—additional tolls should be exacted from air travelers in short-haul markets without a meaningful investigation to determine the compelling justification for them. Dissent of Murphy, Vice Chairman, and Minetti, member, order No. E-21637, January 4, 1965. However, the Board let the increased fares go forward without any hearing or searching inquiry.

It is significant to note that those members dissenting in the above action by the Board estimated that Eastern's price hike would amount to approximately \$6 million in 1965 for additional cost to commuters on the shuttle. In concluding their dissent, these members stated:

It is interesting to note . . . that Eastern has achieved a practical monopoly position in the Boston-New York and the New York-Washington markets and enjoys a most sizable share in the Boston-Washington market. In contrast, on the west coast, in the Los Angeles-San Diego-San Francisco shuttle market where competitive carriers

offer shuttle services with equipment which includes Electras, the charge to the traveler is substantially less for an even greater length of journey.

I am particularly mindful that Congress has given a mandate to the Civil Aeronautics Board to promote competition for the "sound development" of our air transportation system. I am also mindful that the Board in numerous decisions has recognized that a competitively balanced air market—where traffic can sustain it—assures necessary comparisons in cost and operations, and provides incentives for innovation in pricing, services, and the solicitation of new business. This represents an economic philosophy which underlies our national antitrust laws, and which has for years been a basic ingredient of our private enterprise system, including, I might say, that part of our economic system under Federal regulation.

The problem with which we are dealing here is not merely a public interest problem concerning increasing rates and inadequacy of service. It is an antitrust matter of the first order. It involves the elimination of necessary competition and a tremendous concentration of economic power in a regulated industry.

Accordingly, I am today asking the Civil Aeronautics Board to investigate the rising imbalance of competition, and the reasons behind it, on the Boston-New York and the New York-Washington routes, and to take such measures as it has at its disposal for improving this serious situation. If the law is not adequate to cope with this problem, I am asking that the Board recommend such new legislation as may be necessary. I am also requesting that the CAB reconsider an investigation of the reasonableness of present shuttle fares of Eastern Airlines, especially in the light of the above comparison with commuter fares being charged in the competitive San Francisco-Los Angeles market.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have requested the chairman of the subcommittee, the very able junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], that the committee staff make a preliminary inquiry into the antitrust issues involved, including a study of Eastern's economic power in the subject air markets. Senator HART has assured me that such an inquiry will be initiated as soon as possible.

Mr. President, the Civil Aeronautics Board has just acquired a new Chairman, Mr. Charles S. Murphy, who acquired a reputation for fairness during his years of Government service for President Truman and President Kennedy. I think that as a new appointee he is in a position to apply a fresh approach to these problems. He and the rest of the Board now have an opportunity to strike a real blow on behalf of the traveling public.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that exhibits 1 through 5, containing some underlying data concerning the problem presented, be set forth following these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXHIBIT 1

Passenger traffic statistics

NEW YORK TO WASHINGTON

Year	Total		Eastern Air Lines		Northeast Airlines		American Airlines		Others	
	Passengers	Percent change prior year	Passengers	Percent change prior year	Passengers	Percent change prior year	Passengers	Percent change prior year	Passengers	Percent change prior year
1960	831,840		282,300		155,660		276,280		117,700	
1961	934,000	12.3	380,060	34.6	180,590	16.0	250,840	-9.2	122,510	-4.1
1962	1,122,830	20.2	614,710	61.7	89,670	-50.4	233,530	-6.9	184,920	51.0
1963	1,342,910	19.6	1,019,120	67.4	2,330	-97.4	145,750	-37.6	165,730	-10.4
1964	1,495,370	11.5	1,184,450	15.1	270	-88.4	132,480	-9.1	178,170	7.5
Market share (percent):										
1960			33.90		18.70		33.20		14.20	
1961			40.70		19.30		26.90		13.10	
1962			54.70		8.00		20.80		16.50	
1963			76.60		.20		10.90		12.30	
1964			79.21		.02		8.86		11.91	

NEW YORK TO BOSTON

1960	1,051,730		343,930		245,750		394,940		67,110	
1961	1,089,300	3.60	462,780	34.6	248,600	1.2	299,040	-24.3	78,880	17.5
1962	1,289,810	18.40	754,740	63.1	227,660	-8.4	213,200	-28.7	94,210	19.4
1963	1,659,400	28.70	1,291,450	71.1	231,980	1.9	72,020	-66.2	63,950	-32.1
1964	1,814,550	9.40	1,375,590	6.5	306,160	32.0	43,900	-39.1	88,900	39.0
MARKET SHARE										
1960			32.70		23.40		37.50		6.40	
1961			42.40		22.80		27.50		7.30	
1962			58.50		17.70		16.50		7.30	
1963			77.80		14.00		4.30		3.90	
1964			75.81		16.87		2.42		4.90	

Source: From Civil Aeronautics Board statistics.

EXHIBIT 2

History of Eastern Air Lines' shuttle fares¹

FARES SHOWN ARE 1-WAY (EXCLUDING TAX)—ROUND-TRIP FARE IS TWICE THE 1-WAY FARE

Date	Federal tax (percent)	Applicable	New York to Washington	New York to Boston	Boston to Washington	Comment
Apr. 16, 1961	10	All times	\$12.73	\$10.91	(?)	Inaugural.
Dec. 2, 1961	10	do	13.64	11.82		Increase.
Feb. 1, 1962	10	do	13.64	11.82	\$24.55	Inaugural.
Aug. 30, 1962	10	do	14.55	12.73	24.55	Increase (part).
Nov. 16, 1962	5	do	14.29	12.38	23.81	Tax decrease, fare decrease.
Dec. 21, 1962	5	Peak	14.29	12.38	23.81	No change.
		Offpeak	11.43	9.52	20.95	Start of offpeak.
June 1, 1963	5	All times	14.29	12.38		
		Peak			23.81	Canceled offpeak in part.
		Offpeak			20.95	
June 10, 1963	5	All times	14.29			
		Peak		12.38	23.81	Added offpeak in part.
		Offpeak		11.43	20.95	
Jan. 8, 1964	5	All times	15.24			
		Peak		13.33	23.81	Increase in part.
		Offpeak		11.43	20.95	
Oct. 1, 1964	5	Executive shuttle			24.76	Inaugural.
Jan. 15, 1965	5	All times	17.14			
		Peak		15.24	25.71	Fare increases.
		Offpeak	(?)	13.33	22.86	
		Executive	(?)		26.67	

¹ Children under 2, no charge; 2 to 12 years of age, half fare.

² Shuttle service (Boston to Washington) discontinued Apr. 24, 1965.
³ Applies to flights (New York City to Boston) departing between 10:45 a.m. and 2:45 p.m., Monday through Thursdays and all day Saturday.
⁴ Executive shuttle fares canceled, effective May 20, 1965.

Source: Civil Aeronautics Board.

Applicable	New York to Washington	New York to Boston	Boston to Washington	Comment
Current fares (including tax).	All times... \$18.00			
	Peak... \$16.00			
	Offpeak... 14.00	No shuttle		Current fares including tax.

EXHIBIT 3

COMMUTER FARES STABILIZED AFTER NEW WEST COAST FILINGS

Commuter fares on the west coast appeared to be settling down to a permanent pattern after the latest round of tariff changes.

United Air Lines and Trans World Airlines lowered their one-way jet commuter rates between Los Angeles and San Francisco/Oakland from \$14.50 to \$13.50, while Western Air Lines increased its shuttle rate to the same level from \$11.43, following its replacement of DC-6B aircraft with 146-passenger

Boeing 720B fanjets. Pacific Southwest Airlines set an \$11.43 LAX-SFO rate on Lockheed Electras and a \$13.50 rate on its new Boeing 727's.

Western unsuccessfully sought to have CAB suspend TWA's \$13.50 tariff as ambiguous because it allegedly did not detail what service a jet commuter passenger is entitled to as compared to a coach passenger. The six-abreast jet commuter accommodations are in the forward section of the coach compartment on TWA's Boeing 707's and 727's. Family discounts do not apply on commuter fares and no meals are served.

Western also failed to stop a TWA cut in jet coach fares between LAX and SFO, from \$23.70 to \$15.50.

The Board rejected WAL's complaint but upheld the carrier's objections to a United filing in another hotly contested market, Los Angeles-Las Vegas. UAL had applied for a DC-6 propeller fare of \$11.43 to match Western's DC-6B "Thriftyair" commuter rate. The board noted that UAL would have offered four-abreast seating for 69 passengers whereas Western offers five-abreast seating for 87.

Suspending the United tariff, CAB said it does not look with favor on a proposal

which upgrades service while matching fares, where the economic basis of the low-fare proposal would then be undermined.

LAX-SFO TRAFFIC BATTLE HOTTER THAN EVER

The battle for top position in movement of traffic over the busy Los Angeles/Burbank-San Francisco/Oakland air corridor has in recent weeks become hotter than ever.

The two major contenders—Western Air Lines and Pacific Southwest Airlines—are fighting it out along slightly different lines, and neither carrier seems ready to give any quarter.

Western is placing its blue chips on new equipment—four-engine Boeing 720B fan-jets—and an unprecedented marketing campaign tied to that equipment and its one-way jet commuter fare of \$13.50 between LAX and SFO.

PSA also has new jets on the route, three-engine 727's, and its competitive gambits are heavy scheduling and an even lower fare on turboprop flights.

APRIL STEP-UP

Always an aggressive operator, PSA used its first 727 on supplemental service during the Easter holiday period and then put the 122-passenger jets into regular service on April 20, when the intrastate carrier increased its weekly schedules from 358 to 426 flights.

PSA's new fare move—a cut in the San Francisco-Los Angeles/Burbank fare from \$13.50 to \$11.43—took effect on the same date but is applicable only on flights operated with Electra equipment. A similar fare between Oakland and Los Angeles/Burbank went into effect last January 5.

Western, for its part, accompanied its inauguration of fanjet commuter service on the "world's busiest air route" with an intensive 3-month marketing campaign stressing those features designed to appeal most to the "briefcase traveler"—frequent, convenient schedules; fast and efficient ticketing and baggage handling; quality inflight service; travel comfort; and low fares.

It also sought to stress the fact that it flies the four-engine 720B—"the jet with the extra engine"—whereas tri-jet 727's are used in United Air Lines' jet commuter service and PSA's service on the same route.

Other features emphasized in WAL's sales "blitz," a campaign in which 30 salesmen fanned out to cover some 10,000 business offices in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Oakland and the peninsula area, were: new "contour comfort" seats; fast, express ticketing through use of pre-prepared tickets; curbside check-in facilities to cut baggage time; four stewardesses on each flight; and provision of such cabin service "extras" as electric shavers and dictating machines.

ADS SUPPORT DRIVE

Backing up the personal sales calls were extensive newspaper advertising, wide use of TV and radio commercials, and the placing of much billboard advertising.

Western apparently expects that the combination of its new equipment and its sales drive will "clobber" the competition, but its competitors, particularly PSA, are not easily intimidated and have demonstrated that they are rather formidable competitors in their own right.

Meanwhile, as is often the case when airlines get into a competitive battle, it's the air traveler who gets the break.

EXHIBIT 4

[Docket 15713—Order No. E-21637]

ORDER DISMISSING COMPLAINT ADOPTED BY THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD AT ITS OFFICE IN WASHINGTON, D.C., ON THE 4TH DAY OF JANUARY 1965

Passenger fares proposed by Eastern Air Lines, Inc., Northeast Airlines, Inc., Braniff Airways, Inc.

By tariff revisions¹ filed November 10, 1964, marked to become effective January 15, 1965, Eastern Air Lines, Inc., proposes: (1) a general passenger fare revision for all its regular domestic first-class and coach fares, and (2) an increase of approximately \$1.90 per ticket for its individual, executive, and group shuttle fares between Boston, New York/Newark, and Washington. Eastern proposes to reduce all regular fares presently greater than \$50 and increase all fares that are now less than \$50. The revised regular fares have been computed under a formula whereby each existing fare is adjusted so as to reflect the combination of a 5-percent decrease and a \$2.50 increase. Thus, a current fare of \$100 would be reduced to \$97.50, a fare of \$30 would be increased to \$31, and a \$50 fare would remain unchanged. The shuttle fares would be increased by an amount which, including 5-percent transportation tax, will result in a fare increase of \$2 for each air-shuttle ticket. Braniff Airways, Inc., has filed tariff revisions proposing fare reductions in eight markets to match Eastern's revised fares.² Northeast Airlines, Inc., has also filed tariff revisions³ proposing to increase its individual standby propeller fares by approximately \$1.90 (\$2 including tax) in the Boston-New York and Boston-Washington markets, and to cancel its New York-Washington fare for standby service.

National Airlines, Inc., has filed a complaint requesting suspension and investigation of Eastern's proposed fares. The complaint states that National neither opposes nor supports the proposed increase in short-haul fares under \$50; that Eastern's short-haul problem stems in large part from the commuter markets where shuttle service is operated; and that the carrier's commuter service appears underpriced. National contends that the reductions of long-haul fares are small; that they would not increase traffic but would decrease revenues for all carriers; and that Eastern has not proved that the long-haul fares are unreasonable or that such fares are related to short-haul fares. Mohawk has filed a letter supporting Eastern's proposal, and Eastern and the Southern Florida Hotel and Motel Association have filed answers to the National complaint. American and TWA have filed letters commenting on Eastern's proposal. In their letters, the two carriers point out that they do not endorse Eastern's proposal; that such a proposal is not a mandate to the industry to make similar fare adjustments; and contend that if Eastern wishes to increase its short-haul fares, it can do so without upsetting the fare structure of other carriers.

In support of its proposal and in answer to National's complaint, Eastern indicates that the objective of its revised passenger fare structure is to more equitably relate fares to expenses; that it has concluded from its studies that its average fare yield is insufficient to cover average cost, primarily because of its extensive short-haul obligations; and that Eastern's average passenger travels a shorter distance (488 miles) on its route than on any other trunk carrier, excepting Northeast. Eastern asserts that the existing fare structure favors the long-haul carriers and the short-haul passengers; that both long-haul and short-haul carriers should have equal earning opportunities; and that Eastern's proposal is designed to do so. The carrier also contends that the suggestion of National and American that Eastern should

increase its short-haul fares without tampering with the fare structure of other carriers misses its basic objective of improving the economics of short-haul travel, and that such unilateral action by Eastern could raise issues of discrimination.

Upon consideration of the tariff proposals, the allegations in the complaint and answers and of other matters noticed herein, the Board finds that the complaint of National against the proposed fare reductions of Eastern does not state facts which warrant investigation of the Eastern tariff. The request for investigation, and accordingly the request for suspension, will be denied and the complaint dismissed. The proposed fare reductions, in the range of 1 to 3 percent, do not appear outside the range of reasonableness, nor has any showing been made which would indicate that the reduced fares would be unlawful or that they are a threat to the financial stability of competing carriers. Further, we note that the fare reductions would be applicable in the Florida markets where the present level of regular fares is generally higher than in other domestic markets of comparable length.

The Board has reviewed the proposed increases of Eastern and Northeast to their shuttle and standby fares, as well as Eastern's proposed increases to its regular fare service and has determined to permit them to become effective without investigation. The formula presented by Eastern would increase fares in the short-haul markets where unit costs are higher. The increased air-shuttle fares of Eastern and the standby fares of Northeast are within the range of present jet and propeller day coach fares and Eastern has provided backup aircraft and flight personnel to provide extra sections and thus assure accommodations to overflow passengers. In these circumstances we will allow Eastern and Northeast the opportunity to increase their revenues and thus have a better opportunity to cover the operating expenses incurred providing air transportation. This action is consistent with our recent action permitting Southern and Eastern to increase certain fares.⁴

Accordingly, pursuant to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, and particularly sections 204(a), 403, 404, and 1002 thereof,

It is ordered that:

1. The complaint of National Airlines, Inc., in Docket No. 15713, is dismissed; and
2. Copies of this order be served upon National Airlines, Inc., Northeast Airlines, Inc., Eastern Air Lines, Inc., and Braniff Airways, Inc.

By the Civil Aeronautics Board:

[SEAL]

HAROLD R. SANDERSON,

Secretary.

Murphy, Vice Chairman, and Minetti, member, filed the attached joint concurrence and dissent.

⁴Effective October 1, 1964, Southern proposed a general increase in its first class propeller fares averaging about 2 percent. Subsequently, American, Delta, Eastern, National, Trans World, and United proposed to match Southern's increases in markets where competitive with Southern. The Board permitted Southern's and Eastern's higher fares to become effective in recognition of a need for increased revenue; Southern because of an impending reduction in subsidy, and Eastern, because of the systemwide operating losses it has been and still is experiencing. However, the Board suspended the fare increases proposed by the other carriers since those carriers had not shown the need for the additional revenues, which the selective fare increases would produce without corresponding downward adjustments of other fares, and because those carriers were in fact realizing a rising trend of domestic system earnings that were on the whole not inadequate. (Orders WE-21290, September 17, 1964, and E-21529, November 23, 1964.)

¹Revisions to Agent C. C. Squire's CAB No. 44, and Eastern's Air-Shuttle Tariffs Nos. 83, 102, 160, and 161, bearing a posting date of Nov. 10, 1964.

²Revisions to Agent C. C. Squire's CAB No. 44, filed Dec. 16, 1964, effective Jan. 15, 1965.

³Revisions to Northeast's standby tariffs CAB Nos. 39 and 46, filed Dec. 7, 1964, effective Jan. 15, 1965.

MURPHY, VICE CHAIRMAN, AND MINETTI, MEMBER, CONCURRING AND DISSENTING

Eastern's tariff revisions pose substantial public interest questions affecting a great cross section of our traveling public. Accordingly, we would suspend and investigate them.⁵

It is singularly incongruous that at the close of a recordbreaking year for all airlines and on the threshold of what promises to be an even better year—the greatest in aviation history—additional tolls should be exacted from air travelers in short-haul markets without a meaningful investigation to determine the compelling justification for them. If comparable tariff charges were to be exacted on an industrywide level it would appear that \$23 million or more of additional charges would be imposed upon the American traveling public in the year 1965.⁶ It would seem to us that the present record levels of economic growth and prosperity dictate a wise and prudent course in holding the line against inflationary escalation of charges to the public for air transportation as well as other needed services and products. Eastern's proposed tariff changes are not the product of the study submitted but rather were derived by empirical management judgments and we do not understand the majority of the Board to adopt Eastern's formula as a valid rate structure approach.

The rule of ratemaking as laid down by our governing statute requires the board to consider the need in the public interest of adequate and efficient service at the lowest cost consistent with furnishing such service and the need of each carrier for revenue

⁵ While we would prefer to suspend and investigate the entire Eastern proposal we are constrained not to oppose the modest reductions in long-haul fares.

⁶ The formula proposed by Eastern would increase fares in its major short-haul markets by 10 to 15 percent while reducing fares in its long-haul markets by 1 to 3 percent. Since almost two-thirds of total airline trips are less than 700 miles the principal result, if generally applied by all carriers, would be a substantial fare increase for the great majority of airline passengers. The possible adverse impact on traffic growth, therefore, is a matter for serious reflection.

sufficient, under honest, economic and efficient management, to provide adequate and efficient service. This means, in the instant case, that critical analysis of Eastern's revenue "need" is required before permitting substantial price increases to take effect on the basis that the carrier has demonstrated such a need in the filings herein which make no reference whatever to its dramatic improvement in 1964 or to its own forecast of a solidly profitable operation in 1965. The vigorous management effort to restore Eastern to a profitable position has achieved a measure of great success and is a fact upon which management should be complimented. Eastern's figures show that its operating profit is improving, traffic is growing, load factor is improving and that the gap between costs and revenue per ton-mile is rapidly closing.⁷

Eastern's tariff changes have already triggered price increases throughout the system

⁷ Specifically, carrier reports show that Eastern's domestic revenue ton-miles are increasing. Overall revenue load factor is at the highest level since 1960. Eastern's revenue passenger-miles for November 1964 increased 13.5 percent over November 1963 and revenue passenger-miles for the 12 months ended November 30, 1964 were 17.4 percent over the previous year, both increases above the big four and domestic trunkline averages. Even higher percentage increases were experienced in October when Eastern, along with a number of other trunkline carriers reached its all-time traffic peak.

Eastern's November 1964 revenue passenger load factor of 54.4 percent was three points above the big four and domestic trunkline averages and its load factor for the 12 months ended November 30, 1964 of 55 percent was only slightly below the big four and domestic trunkline average load factor. Load factors have been consistently moving upward and are higher now than in 1959, a profitable year.

With more jets in service, Eastern will experience the same highly favorable cost-revenue ratios which the other trunks presently enjoy.

In 1964 Eastern stock moved from a 26½ low to a 46 high and closed out the year at 42¾.

of Allegheny Airlines, including increases not related to competitive markets. These price increases which represent the third price hike by Allegheny since May 1964, we would likewise suspend and investigate.

In terms of added cost to the users, Eastern's price hike will amount to approximately \$6 million in 1965 for the shuttle services alone. (It is interesting to note in this connection that Eastern has achieved a practical monopoly position in the Boston-New York and New York-Washington markets and enjoys a most sizable share of the Boston-Washington market. In contrast, on the West Coast, in the Los Angeles-San Diego-San Francisco shuttle market where competitive carriers offer shuttle services with equipment which includes Electras, the charge to the traveler is substantially less for an even greater length of journey.)⁸

Accordingly, pursuant to section 1002 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, we would suspend and investigate all the related tariffs.

ROBERT T. MURPHY.
G. JOSEPH MINETTI.

⁸ The shuttle fare increases are high in relative terms:

	Peak	Off peak
Shuttle price increases:	Percent	Percent
Boston to New York.....	14.33	16.62
Boston to Washington.....	7.98	9.12
New York to Washington....	12.47	12.47

	Fare	Mileage	Yield (cents)
East coast shuttle fares:			
Boston to New York.....	\$15.24	184	8.28
Boston to Washington.....	25.71	399	6.44
New York to Washington.....	17.14	215	7.97
West coast shuttle fares:			
Los Angeles to San Francisco.....	11.43	340	3.36
Los Angeles to San Diego.....	6.35	109	5.83
San Francisco to San Diego.....	19.85	449	4.42

EXHIBIT 5.—Reports of local and connecting passenger traffic submitted by Civil Aeronautics Board

Boston to New York—Local and connecting passengers (100 percent)

	Year				Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963	
Northeast.....	245,750	248,600	227,060	231,980	271,900
Eastern.....	343,930	462,780	754,740	1,291,450	1,425,990
American.....	394,940	299,040	213,200	72,020	43,330
Allegheny.....	2,480	9,950	17,200	2,860	3,040
National.....	22,080	39,940	48,730	30,360	32,250
TWA.....	26,340	14,080	21,360	25,510	42,310
United.....	13,510	8,630	1,480	1,450	780
Others.....	2,700	6,270	5,440	3,770	3,790
All carriers.....	1,051,730	1,089,300	1,289,810	1,659,400	1,823,390

	Year				Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
	4th quarter 1963	1st quarter 1964	2d quarter 1964	3d quarter 1964	
Northeast.....	52,980	59,330	81,400	78,190	271,900
Eastern.....	373,040	329,700	370,690	352,560	1,425,990
American.....	12,500	9,460	11,840	9,530	43,330
Allegheny.....	610	760	1,150	520	3,040
National.....	7,240	6,410	6,900	11,700	32,250
TWA.....	8,300	9,720	11,210	13,080	42,310
United.....	290	90	220	180	780
Others.....	950	870	1,230	740	3,790
All carriers.....	455,910	416,340	484,640	466,500	1,823,390

New York to Washington—Local and connecting passengers (100 percent)

	Year				Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963	
Northeast.....	155,660	180,590	89,670	2,330	280
Eastern.....	282,300	380,060	614,710	1,029,120	1,159,560
American.....	276,280	250,840	233,530	145,730	131,180
Braniff.....	17,270	18,650	32,790	17,290	19,600
National.....	33,800	53,960	90,600	91,320	90,340
TWA.....	14,470	7,780	16,430	19,890	28,810
United.....	19,840	23,690	36,540	29,200	26,040
Capital ¹	28,370	11,690			
Others.....	3,950	6,740	8,560	8,030	7,500
All carriers.....	831,840	934,000	1,122,830	1,342,910	1,463,310

	Year				Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
	4th quarter 1963	1st quarter 1964	2d quarter 1964	3d quarter 1964	
Northeast.....	50	30	50	150	280
Eastern.....	298,550	243,060	331,060	286,890	1,159,560
American.....	32,410	30,860	37,470	30,440	131,180
Braniff.....	4,440	3,850	5,270	6,040	19,600
National.....	19,590	16,740	26,760	27,250	90,340
TWA.....	4,540	4,580	8,940	10,750	28,810
United.....	6,510	6,200	7,880	5,450	26,040
Others.....	1,780	1,800	2,270	1,650	7,500
All carriers.....	367,870	307,120	419,700	368,620	1,463,310

¹ Capital merged with United, June 1, 1961.

NOTE.—See Boston-Washington table for source.

EXHIBIT 5.—Reports of local and connecting passenger traffic submitted by Civil Aeronautics Board—Continued

On-line origin and destination passenger traffic in both directions between New York and Boston and between New York and Washington, calendar year 1964

Boston to Philadelphia—Local and connecting passengers (100 percent)—Continued

	Passengers (local and connecting) ¹	Carrier's share of market (percent)
New York to Boston:		
All carriers.....	1,814,550	100.00
American Airlines.....	43,900	2.42
Allegheny Airlines.....	2,920	.16
Eastern Air Lines.....	1,365,599	75.81
Mohawk Airlines.....	1,610	.09
National Airlines.....	34,440	1.90
Northeast Airlines.....	306,160	16.87
Trans World Airlines.....	47,020	2.59
United Air Lines.....	900	.05
UK.....	2,010	.11
New York to Washington:		
All carriers.....	1,495,370	100.00
American Airlines.....	132,480	8.86
Allegheny Airlines.....	1,980	.13
Braniff International Airways.....	19,330	1.29
Delta Air Lines.....	2,190	.15
Eastern Air Lines.....	1,184,450	79.21
National Airlines.....	96,350	6.44
Northeast Airlines.....	270	.02
Northwest Orient Airlines.....	50	(²)
Trans World Airlines.....	30,270	2.02
United Air Lines.....	24,910	1.67
UK.....	3,090	.21

¹ 10 percent sample expanded to estimate total.

² Less than 0.005 percent.

Source: "Competition Among Domestic Air Carriers."

Boston to Washington—Local and connecting passengers (100 percent)

Carrier	Year				Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963	
Northeast.....	123,880	169,760	180,490	161,120	178,950
Eastern.....	23,480	28,140	41,430	166,790	170,510
American.....	47,160	25,040	35,320	8,750	30,650
All others.....	10,430	2,880	4,270	4,670	3,730
All carriers.....	204,950	225,820	261,510	341,330	383,840
Share of market (percent):					
Northeast.....	60.4	75.2	69.0	47.2	46.6
Eastern.....	11.5	12.4	15.9	48.9	44.4
American.....	23.0	11.1	13.5	2.5	8.0
Others.....	5.1	1.3	1.6	1.4	1.0
All.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	4th quarter 1963	1st quarter 1964	2d quarter 1964	3d quarter 1964	Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
Northeast.....	40,440	41,770	53,520	43,220	178,950
Eastern.....	53,950	40,530	41,060	34,970	170,510
American.....	250	150	12,970	17,280	30,650
Others.....	970	790	1,060	910	3,730
All.....	95,610	83,240	108,610	96,380	383,840
Share of market (percent):					
Northeast.....	42.3	50.2	49.3	44.8	
Eastern.....	56.4	48.7	37.8	36.3	
American.....	.3	.2	11.9	17.9	
Others.....	1.0	.9	1.0	1.0	
All.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

Source: CAB, "Competition Among Domestic Air Carriers" (10-percent sample), published quarterly and annually. Data has been expanded to show 100 percent in the tables above.

Boston to Philadelphia—Local and connecting passengers (100 percent)

	Year				Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963	
Northeast.....	89,230	94,910	114,950	104,660	96,730
Eastern.....	33,120	57,100	42,980	84,530	106,610
American.....	21,340	550	3,890	1,760	190
Allegheny.....	6,930	14,050	20,170	6,950	5,560
Others.....	2,440	1,900	4,450	6,340	12,270
All carriers.....	153,060	168,510	186,440	203,880	221,360

	4th quarter 1963	1st quarter 1964	2d quarter 1964	3d quarter 1964	Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
Northeast.....	21,550	22,280	27,740	25,160	96,730
Eastern.....	32,840	25,840	26,570	21,360	106,610
American.....	60	60	40	30	190
Allegheny.....	620	1,180	1,430	2,330	5,560
Others.....	2,420	2,140	3,500	4,210	12,270
All carriers.....	57,490	51,500	59,280	53,090	221,360

San Francisco to Los Angeles—Local and connecting passengers (100 percent)

[NOTE.—United inaugurated jet commuter service on Sept. 27, 1964. During the first 4 months of operation (to Jan. 30, 1965) United carried 251,876 passengers on this service.]

	Year				Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963	
United.....	627,680	676,110	494,520	394,530	301,170
Western.....	275,030	222,710	1,314,580	561,270	799,180
TWA.....	81,820	74,530	67,030	86,070	91,920
Pacific.....	8,640	6,380	6,990	5,330	5,870
Others.....	770	2,110	2,630	2,240	2,640
Subtotal ²	993,940	981,840	885,750	1,049,440	1,200,780
PSA ³	385,000	473,000	732,000	943,000	1,100,000
Total.....	1,378,940	1,454,840	1,617,750	1,992,440	2,300,780

	4th quarter 1963	1st quarter 1964	2d quarter 1964	3d quarter 1964	Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
United.....	84,940	71,890	72,200	72,140	301,170
Western.....	176,530	184,310	200,210	238,130	799,180
TWA.....	22,170	19,340	24,160	26,250	91,920
Pacific.....	1,380	1,230	1,440	1,820	5,870
Others.....	500	680	700	760	2,640
Subtotal.....	285,520	277,450	298,710	339,100	1,200,780
PSA.....	246,000	257,000	285,000	312,000	1,100,000
Total.....	531,520	534,450	583,710	651,100	2,300,780

¹ Thriftair service inaugurated June 1, 1962.

² Source: Certificated Carriers—CAB's "Competition Among Domestic Air Carriers."

³ Source: PSA: 1960 (estimated); 1961-64 (California State Public Utilities Commission).

NOTE.—PSA's 4th quarter 1964 dropped to 218,000 (United started jet commuter Sept. 27, 1964).

Los Angeles to San Diego—Local and connecting passengers (100 percent)

	Year				Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963	
United.....	176,630	164,230	121,330	139,100	141,220
American.....	50,680	43,040	39,350	35,590	37,220
Western.....	39,770	31,920	38,600	51,330	59,970
Bonanza.....	4,750	5,040	4,270	6,760	7,320
Others.....	70	2,640	8,850	17,450	29,010
Subtotal.....	271,900	246,870	212,400	250,230	274,740
PSA ¹	97,000	93,000	128,000	162,000	192,000
Total.....	368,900	339,870	340,400	412,230	466,740

	4th quarter 1963	1st quarter 1964	2d quarter 1964	3d quarter 1964	Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
United.....	35,860	33,340	37,290	34,730	141,220
American.....	8,330	7,840	10,230	10,820	37,220
Western.....	9,840	11,120	17,520	21,490	59,970
Bonanza.....	2,160	1,940	1,570	1,650	7,320
Others.....	4,530	5,230	8,890	10,360	29,010
Subtotal.....	60,720	59,470	75,500	79,050	274,740
PSA.....					
Total.....					

¹ Sources: 1960 estimated. 1961-64 California State Public Utilities Commission.

EXHIBIT 5.—Reports of local and connecting passenger traffic submitted by Civil Aeronautics Board—Continued

San Francisco to San Diego—Local and connecting passengers
(100 percent)

	Year				Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963	
United.....	50,120	52,820	30,380	17,200	14,210
Western.....	4,690	4,740	13,100	34,340	38,430
Others.....	60	190	680	590	670
Subtotal.....	54,870	57,750	44,160	52,130	53,310
PSA ¹	139,000	132,000	170,000	200,000	228,000
Total.....	193,870	189,750	214,160	252,130	281,310

San Francisco to San Diego—Local and connecting passengers
(100 percent)—Continued

	4th quarter, 1963	1st quarter, 1964	2d quarter, 1964	3d quarter, 1964	Year ended Sept. 30, 1964
United.....	3,980	3,560	2,920	3,750	14,210
Western.....	7,410	8,580	10,420	12,020	38,430
Others.....	140	150	120	260	670
Subtotal.....	11,530	12,290	13,460	16,030	53,310
PSA.....					
Total.....					

¹ Sources: 1960, estimated. 1961-64, California State Public Utilities Commission.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I have been aware for some time of the interest of the Senator from Massachusetts in the problems of the regulated industries, especially transportation. Today that interest has produced for our serious consideration an informative statement that raises questions about the possible growth of monopoly in one of the country's major transport markets. The implications contained in his remarks are important to the traveler, of course. But they are also of real consequence to those concerned with the role of competition in our economy. They deserve our most thoughtful attention.

What must be remembered is that competition can be as important in a regulated industry, such as air transport, as it is in a manufacturing industry such as steel. Many think that because an industry is regulated by an administrative agency, the question of competition in the industry—or in markets within it—is of no public concern. This simply is not true. Fundamentally, it is the rivalry between firms in an industry that determine its performance, not the fact of regulation.

The critical importance of competition in a regulated context is no better illustrated than in air transport. Although supervised and monitored by the Civil Aeronautics Board, all of the factors influencing the character of air transportation are determined by the interplay of competition between competing airlines operating along any given route.

Take airline fares as an example. Often it is said that fares are "fixed" or "set" by the CAB. This is not correct. The Board passes only upon fares that are proposed by the airlines. It does not itself establish fares; rather, it depends on the usual market process to keep fares at a reasonable level. Experience shows that where there is active competition between air carriers on a route, almost invariably fares are lower and service better. The Los Angeles-San Francisco market, to which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has referred is an excellent illustration of the public benefits which are generated by intense competition between aggressive rival carriers.

By contrast, where there is no competition—where a single carrier dominates a route—it may be found that fares are significantly higher, schedules less con-

venient, flight equipment slower and of lower quality. I should emphasize that these are not mere theoretical speculations. Students of the industry have cited many instances where competition has led to lower fares, improved equipment, and better service to the traveler. And in a number of opinions the CAB itself has recognized that competition is really the best instrument of regulation.

Because competition is so important to the effective functioning of a regulated industry like air transport, this is a matter of concern to the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, on which the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts serves so ably.

I assure the Senator that it will receive our close attention.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts on the statement he has made. Recently he appeared before the Commerce Committee, of which I am a member, while we were holding hearings on the inadequacy of air service. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] made a great contribution in this field.

I invite attention to the middle paragraph on page 7 of the statement which the Senator is making in which he says:

The problem with which we are dealing here is not just a public interest problem concerning increasing rates and inadequacy of service; it is an antitrust matter of the first order. It involves the elimination of necessary competition and a tremendous concentration of economic power in a regulated industry.

This problem, of course, which the Senator from Massachusetts specifically relates, is one dealing with Eastern Air Lines and the shuttle service primarily.

However, as the Senator knows, having attended the hearings of the Commerce Committee, it is a national problem, one dealing with the entire service to the intermediate cities throughout the Nation.

This is a problem the trunklines create for themselves by their failure to provide adequate service to the small nonmetropolitan areas of the Nation, and they are building a monopoly, to which the Senator from Massachusetts refers, by failing to carry out the service for which they were certificated.

We believe that the public interests must be served, and with the assistance of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and many others interested in this problem, we shall endeavor to see

that it is. Eventually, if it is not served, the certificate should be changed and service provided. I believe the Senator agrees that the major trunk lines are now ignoring their responsibility to the public interests.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator has stated quite accurately and cogently one of the principal problems with which we are confronted with a number of the large trunklines. As the Senator has observed, in our region, particularly in New England, we have seen a decrease in their ability to service a number of the different communities. That is a subject of considerable concern to me, and to many other legislators in New England. As the Senator from Tennessee has pointed out, when trunklines receive choice routes, they have a responsibility to provide good, efficient, and effective transportation service to the people in the geographical areas served by the airline. In many instances they have not only been reluctant, but remiss in their duties and responsibilities to fulfill this obligation.

I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Tennessee, who although he represents a different section of the country, nevertheless is equally concerned about the future of the transportation crisis.

Mr. BASS. I appreciate the Senator's comments. As he is well aware, the taxpayers have more than \$2 billion in direct subsidies invested in the development of the air transport service of the Nation. The carriers owe it to the American people to provide the service that is necessary. As the Senator has said, air travel is no longer a luxury; it is an important factor in the business of everyone who has to travel. I appreciate the interest of the Senator from Massachusetts.

What he is saying applies not only to New England, but to the South and the rest of the Nation, as well. The problem affects in particular, every city east of the Mississippi having a population above 100,000. Because of the vast areas of the West, the carriers are in a position to provide better service in that region. So the situation is not so acute west of the Mississippi. But east of the river, the problem is acute, and something should be done to alleviate it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Tennessee, who serves as a member of the Committee on Commerce. He has

a background of experience with this problem. The problem is of deep interest not only to the members of his committee but to all of us who are interested in providing better service to the people of our respective States and areas.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the Senator has made a highly significant and important statement. The two of us have been concerned for some time about the inadequacy of the air service to New England—I, especially with respect to northern New England, and he with respect to his native State of Massachusetts.

We have been very much concerned about the instability and inadequacy of the present service and the uncertainty of future prospects.

I believe that the questions which the Senator has raised in his speech are highly significant and relevant as we undertake to develop public policy and to develop air service which would better serve the future of New England. I believe that these questions are directly related to the public interest. They need to be asked. They need to be answered.

I emphasize the fact that the Senator indicates that he does not disparage the basic idea of low-price commuter-type service. However, I share his belief that that service ought not to be inconsistent with the quality of adequate service for our area of the country.

I believe that it is an indication of the failure of our policy in this field that service to this heavily-populated and important industrial segment of our country should be shrouded in such doubt and uncertainty at the present time.

I compliment the Senator on his speech. There are undoubtedly other questions which have a bearing upon air service to New England, many of which he and I have explored together in the past and will in the future. However, I believe that the questions the Senator has raised today are among the questions that ought to be asked and examined by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maine for his comments and for his support.

As the Senator from Maine has mentioned, he has been concerned, during the time that I have been a Senator, with the provision for good, effective, efficient, and frequent service not only to his State of Maine but to the other New England States.

The comments of the Senator from Maine have been constructive. He is most helpful. I feel that his interest in the questions which we have raised in order to protect the commuters in the many cities in New England has been of significant assistance in placing a real emphasis on this problem.

It is obvious that other parts of the country have enjoyed effective competition, and efficient service. I believe that New England should be entitled to similar competitive service.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. PELL. I congratulate the able junior Senator from Massachusetts on his close pursuit of and expression of concern for the public interest. Exploitation of monopoly situations has long been the subject of close scrutiny by the Congress, and Senator KENNEDY's concern is in this great tradition.

I am particularly interested in my colleague's remarks because they touch on an area of personal involvement for me. I speak of the problems of transportation in the northeast megalopolis. Senator KENNEDY has joined with me in seeking both short- and long-term solutions to this problem, in the hope of achieving some competitive balance between the various transportation modes which would be consistent with national transportation policy.

The public interest requires some exploration of the shuttle situation, and I applaud the junior Senator from Massachusetts for his bringing it to our attention.

Speaking to the broader picture in a broader context—one of my regrets is that we have not arrived at some form of coordinating transportation planning. Such planning is greatly needed.

I hope that as the various irregularities which exist in the transportation situation of today become eliminated and more efficient travel becomes feasible, and the need for such a planning becomes self-evident, that the administration will press ahead to achieve some general overall policy.

It is of particular interest in the megalopolis in which the Senator from Massachusetts and I live, that, whereas in most areas of the country, approximately 90 percent of the intercity travel is by road, and the other 10 percent by competing modes, in megalopolis it is about 60 percent by road and the other 40 percent by the competing modes of transportation—such as air, railroad, and bus.

We depend a great deal more on the common carrier type of transportation in the Northeast than do the people in other parts of the country. For this reason, I doubly applaud the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Rhode Island. The Senator has initiated support for, fought for, and continues to fight for rapid transit service connecting many of the great centers between Boston, New York, and Washington.

The Senator from Rhode Island has shown a sensitivity to the question of transportation which makes every Senator obligated to him. He has stressed rapid commuter service in which he deeply believes. We are indebted to the Senator for his great interest and concern with commuter service and the matter of public policy, and his great effort in trying to find the responsive, accurate, and true answers to many of these questions. I know that this bill guarantees to the commuters who travel

in these areas the most efficient, effective, and comfortable service at the lowest price. We are in desperate need of this service.

I appreciate the comments of the Senator.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following additional reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. MOSS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1764. A bill to authorize the acquisition of certain lands within the boundaries of the Uinta National Forest in the State of Utah, by the Secretary of Agriculture (Rept. No. 467).

By Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1988. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Maryland (Rept. No. 468).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Harry R. Anderson, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 2302. A bill to provide fellowships for elementary and secondary school personnel, to improve the quality of teacher training programs, and to establish a National Teacher Corps; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 2303. A bill to authorize payments to college students for satisfactory undergraduate work; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] be added to the list of cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 85, the measure I introduced proposing a constitutional amendment relating to equal

rights of men and women, and that his name be listed among the sponsors at its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] be added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 311 to S. 600, the Higher Education Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 20, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, July 19, 1965:

THE JUDICIARY

Robert E. Maxwell, of West Virginia, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district

of West Virginia vice Charles F. Paul, deceased.

Luther B. Eubanks, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Oklahoma to fill an additional position created pursuant to the provisions of title 28, section 372(b) of the United States Code.

Aubrey E. Robinson, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia for the term of 10 years, vice Marjorie McKenzie Lawson, resigning.

NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD

The following named persons to be members of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for terms expiring May 10, 1970:

Dr. Mary I. Bunting, of Massachusetts.
Harvey Picker, of New York.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Section 14(b) Serves as a Restraint Upon the Ruthless, Unscrupulous Labor Leaders and Protects the Individual Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, early this year I stated that I was opposed to the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, and that as a matter of principle I would vote against any bill which seeks to repeal this section of the law. Many people, including no doubt a majority of the members of the several unions operating in the 10th District, cannot understand why I have taken this position inasmuch as Missouri does not have a right-to-work law. In responding to letters, from union members, urging me to change my position, I have prepared the following form letter, which sets forth briefly why I have taken this position. Incidentally, I have had many letters and calls from captive members, stating that while they cannot publicly express their views, due to fears of reprisal from their union leaders, they are in accord with my views, as set forth herewith:

DEAR FRIENDS: This will acknowledge your communication, asking that I support the repeal of section 14(b).

Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is the last remaining restraint upon those labor leaders, some of whom have demonstrated their desire to exercise dictatorial powers over the members of their unions. This section does provide protection to the individual member, and while this section has no direct effect on union members in Missouri, the fact that it does remain in the law and is effective in some 19 States, serves as a protection to all workers in Missouri.

As I have stated repeatedly, the union worker in Missouri is not adversely affected by section 14(b), but if it is repealed, it is my opinion that not only he, but the entire public would be adversely affected; the unscrupulous union leader would be unleashed and the rights of the individual union member would be further jeopardized. Good unions which are being fairly operated in

the best interests of their members do not need the repeal of section 14(b), and the others should continue to be restrained by this section, if for no other reason than to protect the interests of the individual members of the union, many of whom are captive members who do not condone or approve of many of the tactics used by irresponsible leaders who use coercive methods in extracting dues and other payments which are not necessary in the operation of the legitimate union.

In closing may I state again that I believe I am representing the views of a majority of my constituents in opposing the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, and this includes many members, if not a majority of the members of the several unions in the 10th District.

Respectfully yours,

PAUL C. JONES,
Member of Congress.

Rural Mail Car Leasing: An Impractical Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to establish a car-leasing program for the rural mail carriers of America is impractical and unsound.

As a representative of a rural district—the great Fourth District of Tennessee—I want to go on record now as saying that the proposal is ill-conceived and impractical. It is not responsive to the circumstances that govern and control rural carrier operations.

It is fiscally irresponsible.

It is a reflection on the rural carrier system as now constituted.

It would be a great mistake to implement this concept.

Here are some of the effects it would have:

The local economies would suffer because the sale of cars would be reduced, insurance business would suffer, general repair shops would have their volume re-

duced, and tire dealers would be denied the patronage of the rural carriers.

There would be substantial losses in State gas taxes and car license proceeds.

There would be losses in Federal gas taxes.

There would be loss of standby vehicles for route emergencies.

Administrative costs for record keeping on the proposed new arrangement would be excessive. There would be many other disadvantages, to the Government and the public should this ill-conceived proposal materialize.

This proposal, Mr. Speaker, should be defeated.

Day of Trinity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, July 16, was the 20th anniversary of the first successful explosion of an atomic bomb.

July 16, 1945, marked the culmination of an extensive program begun even before the assault on Pearl Harbor. The program brought many of the finest military, scientific, and administrative men in America to work together in close contact and cooperation, for this was the beginning of the intimate alliance between our Government and the leaders of industry and science, to guide and promote the use of atomic energy.

Lansing Lamont presents the factual history of that atomic bomb program in his book "The Day of Trinity." But even more, he has captured the drama and uncertainty that pervaded this period, where mankind stepped up to a new plateau of greater self-potential and self-destruction.

Mr. Lamont has worked the thousands of day-by-day steps in the development of the atomic bomb into a story of emotion, hope, and humor. This is indeed an historical work of the highest merit. It reveals the characters of the men in-